DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 810 95 SO 000 172

AUTHOR DeCecco, John; And Others
TITLE Civic Education for the Seventies: An Alternative to Repression and Revolution. Volume I.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Center for Research and Education in American Liberties.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education.
BUREAU NO BR-8-0457
PUB DATE Jun 70
GRANT OEG-0-8-080457-3737(085)
NOTE 197p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$9.95
DESCRIPTORS Activism, Citizenship, *Civics, *Democratic Values, *Educational Administration, Educational Objectives, Educational Research, *High School Students, Interpersonal Competence, Political Socialization, Public Affairs Education, School Community Relationship, Social Action, Social Studies, *Student Participation, Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

Civic education is the student's participation in the governance of the school and the community; it must create and serve democratic society. Today's youth must be given the tools: 1) to transform vertical governance of the school and community into horizontal governance which shares decision-making with students, parents, and teachers; and, 2) to distinguish between values which are basic moral commitments for all of us, and values and value patterns which must be left to individual choice and preference. This position grows out of: 1) the examination of the social science literature dealing with contemporary political and social changes (Volume II); 2) studies of student perceptions of democratic dilemmas in the high schools --a cross-sectional comparison, urban-suburban comparison, comparison among high schools with black students, and the development of the interpersonal aspect of political socialization (chapters 2-7); 3) the analysis of student unrest as documented in local newspapers throughout the nation; and, 4) case studies of particular high schools where there was serious confrontation and conflict. This research establishes the framework for the development of Frank Summers' "Manual of Objectives and Guidelines for High School Civic Education" (Chapter 9). (SBE)

ED041810

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CIVIC EDUCATION FOR THE SEVENTIES: AN ALTERNATIVE TO REPRESSION AND REVOLUTION

Volume I

DeCecco
Richards
Summers
Harrison
Brussell
Mandel

SO 000 172

Center for Research and Education
in American Liberties

Teachers College, Columbia University

ED041810

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JOHN DeCecco
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CIVIC EDUCATION FOR THE SEVENTIES:

AN ALTERNATIVE TO REPRESSION AND REVOLUTION

Volume I

John DeCecco, Arlene Richards, Frank Summers, Josephine Harrison,
Edward Brussell and James Mandel

Center for Research and Education in American Liberties

Teachers College, Columbia University

Project No. 8-0457, Grant No. OEG-0-8-080457-3737 (085).
Bureau of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research,
United States Office of Education,
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Copyright, June 1970

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS*

Alan F. Westin, Ph.D.
Professor of Government and Public Law
Columbia University
Director, Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, Teachers College - Columbia University

John P. DeCecco, Ph.D.
Professor of Education and Psychology
San Francisco State College
Project Director, Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, Teachers College - Columbia University

RESEARCH STAFF

John P. DeCecco, Ph.D.
Research Director and Project Coordinator

Arlene Richards, Ed.D.
Associate Research Director

Project Associates

Josephine Harrison, M.A.
Raymond Smith, M.A.

Ruth Hornberger, M.A.
Frank Summers, M.A.

Research Assistants

John Baerst, M.A.
Deborah Gordon, M.A.
Sandra Davidson Mann, M.A.
Ellen Schroeder, M.A.

Edward Brussell, M.A.
Wendy Kaplan, B.A.
James Mandel, LL.B., M.A.
Ralph Smith, M.A.
Lucinda White, B.A.

Staff Secretary
Molly Johnson

Project Editor
Josephine Harrison

Fiscal Officer
Courtney McKeeman

CONSULTANTS

Arno Bellack, Teachers College

James Farganis, Brooklyn College

Kent Jennings, University of Michigan

Hanan C. Selvin, State University of New York at Stony Brook

Mark Chesler, University of Michigan

Allen Gaskin, University of Michigan

Dale Mann, Teachers College

Murray Tondow, Palo Alto School System

Belvin Williams, Teachers College

*Professor Louis Levine in the beginning was a principal investigator but withdrew from the project in its early phase and did not participate in the writing of this report.

To MINNA POST PEYSER

Who, in the first place, made this all possible

PREFACE

Our reflections and research on the objectives of civic education for the seventies are contained in two volumes. The first or major volume contains the position paper, research methodology and findings, and the manual of objectives for civic education. The second volume contains the substantive document with which the project and research began.

When Professors Alan Westin of Columbia, the Director of the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, and Louis Levine of San Francisco State asked me to join them in July, 1968, as co-investigator and research director of this project,* I believe we all assumed that we would finally produce a tidy bundle of objectives for the social studies curriculum phrased as behaviors we could all observe and measure. The use of behavioral objectives as the basis for constructing curricular materials and designing instruction reached its high point about 1968 and the ideological fervor of its leaders left us with the very limited options of being for or against behavioral objectives. I was intimately a part of the movement because I published a textbook in educational psychology which contained an impressive list of behavioral objectives for each chapter. Our original conception of the project, therefore, was to specify the objectives for the new civic education in behavioral terms and, in the subsequent projects, construct and design the curricular materials and instructional interventions appropriate to these objectives, and finally to develop the tests which would measure student achievement of the objectives. It was a simple instructional model, described by Professor Levine in the research proposal.

Trouble, however, lay ahead. My first job was to develop some sense of the drift of contemporary American institutions--the local, state, and federal governments, the business and industrial office, the labor unions, the church, the family, and the school--to try to account for the increasing number and volume of complaints of the individuals who served and were served by these institutions. In the 1960s, the word "Establishment" became the epithet unhappy people used to describe the apparent arbitrariness and faceless rigidity of most contemporary American institutions which were unable to yield to the strongest feelings of discontent even in the face of paralyzing strikes, barricades, and fire bombs. And the normal processes of change--the political mechanisms of election, conventions, lobbying, public persuasion and pressure and so on, seem to falter so badly that they were more part of the problem than part of the solution. This analysis of the contemporary state of American institutions and the rising demand for participation as a means of making institutions more responsive to individual and group needs and hopes is contained in the substantive document for this project, entitled Civic Participation in a Crisis Age. The document grew out of Alan Westin's theory of civic participation (which includes decision-making, dissent, due process, and equality), Louis Levine's social articulation theory and an extensive examination of contemporary social science literature. Because of its length and nature, this document appears under a separate cover as Volume Two.

---

*USOE Project No. 80457. Professor Levine, because of illness, left the project in December, 1968.

Without conscious intent, what the document produced was a social conflict theory which crystallized the individual and group options we have for confronting and escaping the political and social problems almost crippling contemporary institutions. We began to see that we were not dealing with a closed subject matter to be neatly packaged as behavioral objectives and programmed lessons but with the cries of people demanding more control over their own and their children's lives. But the demands for participation in decision-making were often unmatched with either the strength or motivation to make and live by one's own decisions. In any case, another packaged curriculum with all major objectives specifically predetermined was neither possible nor needed. We began to define civic education as the student's participation in the governance of the school and community. What the new civic education had to teach students was the conscious making of choices in the services students provided for their fellow students and the adult community and the keeping of faith with one's fellow man by sticking with the choices they made. Delivery needs to follow choice.

In the paper which appears here in Chapter I, Civic Education in the Reform Era: A Position Paper for the Seventies, and which was prepared as the concluding document for the project, you can see the distance which I travelled from July, 1968 to March, 1970. In many ways the paper marks the rather profound change in the thinking of most of the project staff that remained to the end but Dr. Richards (Chapters II thru VII) and Mr. Summers (Chapter IX) speak eloquently for themselves. In excluding teachers, parents, and students from decision-making, the school, like other American institutions, could not respond to the changing needs and aspirations of those they were to serve and, consequently, appeared more and more arbitrary and archaic each new school year. By the end of the project it was clear to all of us that the school, as the chief agent of civic education, had to find many different ways to broaden the base of decision-making to include all those individuals and groups who had a vital stake in the school.

Under the present conditions of institutional disarray and even plain dysfunction, it seemed sensible to Arlene Richards, Raymond Smith (The Center Institute Director), Alan Westin and myself that we ask students to describe for us incidents which illustrated the institutional "pinches" or conflicts they either experienced or witnessed in the school or elsewhere and what they did and believed they could do to resolve the issue. It was not the time to ask students to describe how the school successfully met their needs. Even when we explicitly asked for such positive examples of institutional function, we got the same old complaints. In Chapter II of this report, Dr. Richards and her assistants describe how we collected and analyzed our data and the conclusions we were able to reach.

I want to acknowledge here the invaluable and indispensable contribution of Dr. Richards who supervised with humane efficiency a research team of about forty interviewers working in about as many different schools and then went on to the gargantuan job of developing and supervising the coding, analysis, and interpretation of the data. Her faith, creativity, and hard work kept the peoject alive at all the critical moments. In these tasks she had the help of bright and loyal assistants, John Baerst, Edward Brussell, Sandra Davidson Mann, Josephine Harrison, and James Mandel, whose names appear on the reports in Chapters III thru VIII.

One process of the psychology of political socialization which has been the subject of previous theory and research in both the United States and Western

Europe is one which Jean Piaget has termed "decentering." It is a theory of moral development in adolescents involving the development of ideals and the differentiation of one's own points of view from that of others and the enlargement of one's social horizons. From our data, and as a separate but related study, we were able to investigate the decentering phenomenon and have included that report as Chapter VII.

In the process of training raters, briefing respondents, and collecting data we developed several films and film segments, as described by James Mandel in Chapter VIII. We have a live filmic interpretation of student-teacher interaction in a social studies class in a suburban New York high school and the cinema verité films illustrating the concepts of dissent and equality. All three of these we used for training and briefing purposes. From the extensive film footage we acquired on student conflict during the fifty-day New York City teachers' strike (1968-69) we have four film segments, one for each of Alan Westin's dimensions of civic participation defined in the original substantive document--decision-making, dissent, equality, and due process--and a feature length film, Ira, You'll Get Into Trouble, representing a masterful producing and editing achievement of Steve Sbarge of New York City, of conflict incidents and student discussions occurring before, during, and after the strike.

The culmination of the project was the Manual of Objectives and Guidelines for High School Civic Education, prepared by Frank Summers (Chapter IX). Mr. Summers had assisted Dr. Richards in the data collection and analysis and was thoroughly familiar with the direction and import of the research. His background in philosophy, psychology, and education was useful in moving away from a strictly behavioral specification of objectives to statements of objectives and guidelines consistent with conclusions set forth in the substantive document and the research reports and, we believe, maximally useful for the new civic education. The format Mr. Summers designed for the Manual includes a terse statement of the objective and guideline and examples from the students' descriptions of failure and success in meeting the objective or guideline.

There are many others we can thank for their loyalty and help: the interviewers who had to brave the schools and the students; the research assistants acknowledged in the accompanying report; Molly Johnson who had to do the typing of reports in their embryonic stages and, in her ladylike manner, kept us at the job; and to Jo Harrison who let us abuse her editorial talents so that we could weave all this together and Donald R. Zahner who came to the editor's assistance during the crucial period of proofreading; Raymond Smith, the Center Institute Director, who kept the project tied to the civil libertarian traditions of the Center, and Courtney McKeeman who kept us fiscally solvent and alive for as long as he could.

The impact on us of these endeavors has been to alert us to the great unsatisfied needs of today's parents, teachers, and students and to the importance of professional educators and social scientists to be Civic Men as well as Private Scholars, who help rebuild and enjoy our schools and communities.

John P. DeCecco

New York City, 1970

Contents

Page

Preface. iii

List of Figures and Tables x

I. CIVIC EDUCATION IN THE REFORM ERA: A POSITION PAPER FOR THE SEVENTIES
John P. DeCecco

Prologue 1
Basis for our Position 1
Participation. 3
The Multi-Value Society. 3
Basic Democratic Values. 3
Middle Class Values. 4
Civic Complaints and Value Conflict. 5
Options for Change: Individual Civic Styles. 6
Options for Change: Social Conflict Styles 8
Vertical School Governance 10
Horizontal School Governance 11
School-Community Relations 12
The New Civic Education. 13

II. THE METHODOLOGY: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS
John DeCecco, Arlene Richards, Raymond Smith, Josephine Harrison

Introduction 16
Data Collection. 17
Coding 19
Data Analysis. 27

III. OVERALL RESULTS
Arlene Richards

Civic Participation Categories 32
Content Categories 34
Psychological Process Categories 34
Alternatives and Convictions 36
Conflict Resolution I: Negotiation vs. Decision by Authority. 37
Conflict Resolution II: Use of Force 37
Affect Categories. 38
Data Analysis Reliability. 38
Conclusions. 40

Page

IV. CROSS-SECTIONAL COMPARISON
Arlene Richards

Civic Participation Categories 42
Content Categories 45
Psychological Process Categories 47
Alternatives and Convictions 52
Conflict Resolution I: Negotiation vs. Decision by Authority 54
Conflict Resolution II: Use of Force 55
Affect Categories. 58
Conclusions. 59

V. URBAN-SUBURBAN COMPARISON
Arlene Richards

Civic Participation Categories 60
Content Categories 62
Psychological Process Categories 65
Alternatives and Convictions 69
Negotiation vs. Decision by Authority. 71
Use of Force 74
Affect Categories. 77
Conclusions. 81

VI. HIGH SCHOOLS WITH BLACK STUDENTS COMPARISON
Arlene Richards and Edward Brussell

Civic Participation Categories 83
Content Categories 84
Psychological Process Categories 86
Alternatives and Convictions 87
Conflict Resolution I: Negotiation vs. Decision by Authority. 89
Conflict Resolution II: Use of Force 90
Outcome and Tension Level. 91

VII. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERPERSONAL ASPECT OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION
Arlene Richards and Josephine Harrison

Decentering. 93
Protagonist and Antagonist 94
Distance 95
Cross-Sectional Study. 95
Urban-Suburban Comparison. 97
High Schools with Black Students Comparison. 98
Educational Level Comparison 99

Page

VII. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERPERSONAL ASPECT OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION (Continued)

Group Size 99
Cross-Sectional Study. 101
Urban-Suburban Comparison. 102
High Schools with Black Students Comparison. 102
Educational Level Comparison 104

Relative Status. 106
Cross-Sectional Study. 107
Urban-Suburban Comparison. 109
High Schools with Black Students 109
Educational Level Comparison 109

Personification. 113
Cross-Sectional Study. 113
Urban-Suburban Comparison. 114
High Schools with Black Students Comparison. 116
Educational Level Comparison 117

Conclusions. 117

VIII. PROJECT FILMS
James Mandel 122

IX. MANUAL OF OBJECTIVES AND GUIDELINES FOR HIGH SCHOOL CIVIC EDUCATION
Frank Summers

Introduction 125
Objective
One: Decision-making 127
Two: Alternative Courses of Action . . . . .
Three: Analyzing Courses of Action 132
Four: Negotiation, Mediation, Arbitration. 134
Five: Viewpoints Other Than One's Own. 137
Six: Democratic Issues in Others' Problems 140
Seven: Group Action. 141
Eight: Personal/Institutional Issues 144
Nine: Principles Involved in Concrete Problems 147
Ten: Relating Principles to Relevance. 149
Summary. 151
Preface to Development Guidelines. 152
Guideline
One: Junior High Problems as Individual. 153
Two: Senior High Problems as Group 155
Three: Junior High Conflicts with Peers. 156
Four: Senior High Conflicts with Institutions. 158
Five: Senior High Abstractive Capacity 160
Conclusion 163
Supplement: A Guide to the Content of Civic Education. . . 165

Page

APPENDIX
A: Interview Form 167
B: Interviewer Selection and Training 168
C: Schools Visited. 173
D: Characteristics of Some Schools Visited. 174
E: Code Book. 179
F: Content Categories Description 183

Figures and Tables

		Page
Figure		
1*	Interpersonal Involvement of Writer and Protagonist of the Incident	22
2*	Interpersonal Involvement of Writer and Antagonist of the Incident	23
Table		
1	Overall Comparison: Political Participation Categories of Incidents as Ranked by 1 or 2 by Students and Coders	32
2	Overall Comparison: Content of Incidents Described by Students	34
3	Overall Comparison: Distance and Group Size	34
4	Overall Comparison: Relative Status and Personification	35
5	Overall Comparison: Alternative, Conviction and Expediency	36
6	Overall Comparison: Conflict Resolution I: Negotiation and Decision by Authority	37
7	Overall Comparison: Conflict Resolution II: Use of Force	37
8	Overall Comparison: Outcome and Tension Level	38
9	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Inter-rater Reliability	39
10	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Participation Categories Ranked 1 or 2 by Students and Coders	42
11	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Content Categories	46
12	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Interpersonal Involvement: Distance and Group Size	48
13	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Relative Status and Personification.	50
14	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Alternatives and Conviction.	52
15	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Negotiation and Decision by Authority.	54
16	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Use of Force	56
17	Cross-Sectional Comparison: Outcome and Tension Levels	58
18	Urban-Suburban Comparison: Participation Categories Ranked 1 or 2 by Students and Coders.	61
19	Urban-Suburban Comparison: Content Codes	63
20	Urban-Suburban Comparison: Interpersonal Involvement: Distance and Group Size.	66
21	Urban-Suburban Comparison: Relative Status and Personification	68
22	Urban-Suburban Comparison: Alternatives and Conviction	70
23	Urban-Suburban Comparison: Negotiation and Decision by Authority.	72
24	Urban-Suburban Comparison: Use of Force.	75
25	Urban-Suburban Comparison: Outcome and Tension Levels.	78
26	High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Participation Codes Ranked 1 or 2 by Coders.	83
27	High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Content Categories.	85
28	High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Distance and Group Size	87
29	High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Relative Status and Personification.	88

*Figures 1 and 2 appear also in Chapter VII, p. 94.

Table		Page
30	High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Alternatives and Conviction	89
31	High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Negotiation and Decision by Authority	90
32	High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Use of Force	91
33	High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Outcome and Tension Levels	92
34	Interpersonal Involvement I: Overall Results	95
35	Protagonist: Distance: Cross-Sectional Comparison	96
36	Protagonist: Distance: Urban-Suburban Comparison	97
37	Protagonist: Distance: High Schools with Black Students Comparison	98
38	Protagonist: Distance: Educational Level Comparison	100
39	Protagonist: Group Size: Cross-Sectional Comparison	101
40	Protagonist: Group Size: Urban-Suburban Comparison	103
41	Protagonist: Group Size: High Schools with Black Students Comparison	104
42	Protagonist: Group Size: Educational Level Comparison	105
43	Interpersonal Involvement II: Overall Results	107
44	Antagonist: Relative Status: Cross-Sectional Comparison	108
45	Antagonist: Relative Status: Urban-Suburban Comparison	110
46	Antagonist: Relative Status: High Schools with Black Students Comparison	111
47	Antagonist: Relative Status: Educational Level Comparison	112
48	Antagonist: Personification: Cross-Sectional Comparison	114
49	Antagonist: Personification: Urban-Suburban Comparison	115
50	Antagonist: Personification: High Schools with Black Students Comparison	116
51	Antagonist: Personification: Educational Level Comparison	118

Chapter I

CIVIC EDUCATION IN THE REFORM ERA: A POSITION FOR THE SEVENTIES

John P. DeCecco

Prologue

We speak here to the young, the not-so-young, and the old who join this decade's effort to reform the urban school and community. We speak to all those individuals who are asking for a decisive voice in the affairs affecting their liberty and happiness.

We state here our position on civic education in the seventies. We believe that civic education is the student's participation in the governance of the school and community. We believe that the new civic education will occur as we help our young people transform vertical governance of the school and community into horizontal governance which shares decision-making with students, parents, and teachers.

Civic education in the seventies must create and serve democratic society. It must help young people distinguish between values which are basic moral commitments for all of us and values and value patterns which must be left to individual choice and preference. The democratic society ascribes the highest value to the individual and to relations among individuals which embody the values of equality, mutuality, and receptivity.

Democratic institutions first of all must serve the needs of the individuals who belong to them and, in this way, build institutional faith and loyalty. Beyond institutional membership, race, class, status, wealth, and nationality there stands the individual human being who must be free in our time to join his fellow man to rebuild and enjoy our cities and our schools.

Basis for Our Position

Our position on civic education grows out of our examination of the social science literature dealing with contemporary political and social changes (DeCecco, 1969), our studies of student perceptions of democratic dilemmas in the high schools (Richards, Chapters II-VII), our analysis of student unrest as documented in local newspapers throughout the nation (Westin, ed., 1970), and our case studies of particular high schools where there was serious confrontation and conflict (Murphy, 1970 and Westin, ed., 1970). The statement of this position provides the framework for and reflects our statement of the future objectives for civic education (Summers, Chapter IX).

Contemporary social science literature unmistakably points to the rising demand for participation in decision-making in all American institutions as institutional missions and individual goals and needs more and more diverge. In business and industry there are the growing demands for a voice in decisions affecting not only wages and working conditions but also the goals of production, due process in personnel policies, and the right to individual life-styles in dress and manners at and away from work. In unions there are increasing member

demands for protection of the right to dissent, participation in union electoral processes, the lifting of discriminatory barriers to membership and work, and the asserting of local autonomy within the national union organization. In the church the demand for participation reflects the rising concern of laymen and clergymen to make the church more responsive to pressing human and social need and to leave to individual choice the practices of birth control and celibacy. There is the growing desire of the citizenry for fuller information on government policy and practice in both national and international affairs and to use public assembly and demonstration to change policies and practices inimical to their own and their children's interests. In the family wives and mothers continue to demand connubial and parental parity in decision-making and the children to demand earlier and stronger voices in selecting their own options and life-styles.

Our own data collection and analysis clearly show the vivid demand and necessity for student participation in the governance of the school. In all schools, in the urban ghetto and suburbs, the incidents of conflict reported by students involve school governance. Although conflicts originally arise when the school principal makes decisions which disregard student preferences, as in matters of dress codes, free movement within the school building, the use of school facilities and so on, they are perceived by the students as the result of their exclusion from the governance of the school. Students report no alternative courses of action when conflict arises and this absence of choice results in their pervasive frustration and inevitable alienation. Of all American institutions it is particularly ironical that the one institution charged with the mission of teaching democracy is usually perceived by the student as one that leaves him powerless.

One student (Fox, 1970, p. 61) describes his exclusion from school governance and his despair by comparing the school's treatment of students with the farmer's treatment of cows:

> This summer I worked on a farm, being an "Aggie," and coming back to Browne I noticed a number of corollaries between the cows and the students here. The first is that the farmer doesn't give a damn about his cows. He cares only when it involves the cows' milk production. The only time Farmer X cares about us is when it involves our production. We produce marks and grades instead of milk. We are also bred for further production outside of John Browne School. When a farmer notices that a cow isn't producing well enough he "calls" her out and sells her to the slaughter house. In the same way, we are called out after Browne into college and remain with the herd, or into the Army to be slaughtered.
>
> The greatest similarity is feeding time. The cows are herded into the barn, crowded together outside a little door where they have to go in slowly, one at a time, just as we are crowded in from in front of the lunchroom door, where one of Farmer X's helpers checks our program cards. Once in the barn they are locked in--we are locked in also. We are cows. The cows are then led out in a herd and back into the field. They can't leave the herd because the doors are locked to keep them in. The cow has no recourse to abuse by the farmer. We can have no recourse to abuse by the teachers. The cows have numbers and records which are carefully kept. We have Delaney cards and transcripts, also carefully kept. The cows live in a carefully regulated day, never asked what they want to do, but told, just as we are told.

Participation

Participation in the making of decisions is the way individuals and groups keep institutions responsive to their changing needs and interests. When institutions deny any individual or group belonging to them access to decision-making, they tend to serve the interests of governing elites and to become bureaucracies with morbid life cycles of their own, serving in the end the interests of no one. Since all institutions are human and fallible, institutional forms inevitably give rise to the complaints of those who feel the neglect of their interests and needs. Participation in decision-making helps the dissatisfied voice their own complaints and expectations, hear those of others, and negotiate changes which reconcile old and new demands. We believe that there should not be the obligation but the opportunity to participate in decision-making whenever we feel vital interests are at stake. Not all individual needs can or should be met through institutional decisions and rules. The choice of the individual to participate and not to participate preserves autonomy and privacy where the individual most highly values these. Institutions serve us and we serve them only to the extent that they keep us free and happy. But we can and most often do love, serve, and fight each other without direct institutional mediation and participation.

The Multi-Value Society

The prologue asserts that democratic society provides each individual his own choice of values and opportunities. It is, in this sense, a multi-option and multi-value society. From its early post-revolutionary days to the present decade American society, however, has peculiarly sought value consensus. Our almost instinctive response to individuals with life-styles and beliefs that differ from our own is to bring them into the consensual fold by arguing or intimidating them out of their "peculiarity" or to banish them from our social circles by subverting any possible modus vivendi. Despite our proud espousal of a tradition of rugged individualism, we are a strangely clinging people. We amalgamate individual ingredients so that separateness and difference among friends and associates are hardly perceptible or we reject the ingredients as wholely foreign and contaminating. Even American extremists of the right and left manifest a strange longing for the love of groups on both sides of their barricades and react to opposition and dissent with cries of treachery.

One contemporary reaction to the disintegration of the national value consensus is to assert an equality of values which allows each individual "to do his own thing." Although this reaction may eventually move us closer to an acceptance of individual difference and arithmetic equality, it does not guarantee that kind of receptive and mutually beneficial transactions which utilize individuality to produce a society of personal service, freedom, and pleasure. Human freedom and pleasure require connectedness and concern and cannot result from each individual seeking only his own lonely destiny.

Basic Democratic Values

The new civic education must teach the distinction between those basic moral commitments which allow freedom and fulfillment for all individuals and those private commitments which represent the concrete style and mood each of us gives to his life. We believe that the basic moral commitment must be to

individual liberty and happiness. All the political, social, intellectual, and technological inventions of man should serve the enhancement of human freedom and happiness. The new civic education must somehow produce individuals who will build that society which makes the dignity of the individual the sine qua non of all civic enterprise. It must produce those social and civic changes which make mutual openness and helpfulness our deepest source of satisfaction.

In non-democratic societies value does not reside intrinsically in the individual human being but extrinsically in the services he renders or the collectivity to which he belongs. In societies of privilege and status the measure of individual value is the station one occupies, with those in low station rendering service to those in high station. In highly industrial societies the measure of individual value is the work one gives to maintain and increase productivity and profit. In militaristic societies the measure of individual value is service to the State, with those in command positions valued more highly than those in obedience positions. In each case, in return for the sacrifice of personal equality, mutuality, and choice the individual is promised and often obtains the relatively stable satisfaction of his own and his children's survival needs.

In non-democratic societies play as opposed to work, rest and indulgence as opposed to the endless pursuit of material security, and immediate as opposed to delayed gratification are enjoyed by relatively small elites. Two moral systems are at work--one for the privileged and powerful which values freedom and pleasure and one for the non-privileged and weak which values work, service, and security. Social revolutions are often the fearful and guilty efforts of the underprivileged to realize for themselves the values of the overprivileged.

Middle Class Values

The dominant value system of American society is often called "middle class." This value system is first the product of a puritan, religious ethic which emphasizes the virtues of hard work, frugality, restraint in the gratification of physical desires, and a generally plain and reserved life-style and comportment. It is also the product of modern industrial and technological society which elevates to the level of moral virtue social status, occupational achievement, productivity, efficiency, ever-expanding profits, and institutional permanence. The puritan and entrepenurial ethic have uncommon conjugal compatibility because the one implants sufficient fear and guilt in the individual to render him relatively impervious throughout his lifetime to distracting libidinal yearnings and the other provides limitless economic horizons for the diversion of pent-up wishes and energy. It is hard to imagine one ethic functioning well without the other.

The middle class system of values has enjoyed such obvious success in raising the standard of living and comfort and in combating hunger and disease that we always point to its shortcomings with reluctance. One can make the convincing historical argument that had not middle class fathers and mothers and sons and daughters foregone the pleasures of the flesh and dedicated themselves to production and efficiency we would never have reached the level of economic prosperity which enables us now to enjoy a wider value perspective. Since there is particular finality about the historical past we are willing to let the argument rest there. The central point is that the voices of the young in the

suburbs and cities and of the young and old in the ghetto are asserting the priority of democratic over middle class values. It is to these voices and their complaints and aspirations that we now turn.

Civic Complaints and Value Conflict

The "generation gap" which presumably separates young and old is probably the metaphor which best describes the vivid confrontation of the democratic values of individual liberty and happiness with the corporate values of self-restraint, productivity, and efficiency. The metaphor is misleading because value rather than age is the dividing factor. The fact that the "generation gap" exists throughout all industrial nations of the world is probably testimony of the desire of countless individuals to preserve some measure of individual autonomy and joy within or outside corporate systems of industry and government which seem inexorably to subordinate personal to institutional needs and goals. The tragic reality is that self-denying, achievement-motivated adults are so habituated to placing institutional before individual needs that it takes a wrenching emotional effort for them to realize how widely personal and institutional destinies can and do diverge. Consequently, although adult and adolescent address themselves to the same institutions, the adult views the problem from the angle which ignites young tempers and deafens young ears, of self-discipline and social responsibility. For the young the old appear to oppose life and love and for the old the young appear to oppose all institutional forms. Both young and old, however, are searching for the proper relationship in our time of individuals and institutions.

The civil rights movement asserted the right of people who are black, brown, white, and yellow to human relations of equality and reciprocity. But the very claim for dignity and justice by large minorities has sensitized the moral consciences of all of us to the general selfishness and degradation of life in the city and the suburb. Our work lives have become bureaucratic tangles yielding rewards without satisfaction and our private lives frantic attempts to recapture the freedom and pleasure disappearing from our work lives. Now that the civil rights movement has taught us how to see the fundamental worth and humanity of each individual we seem ready to surrender not only the color stereotypes but also the stereotypes of nationality, sex, status, class, money, dress, physical appearance, and so on. It has also taught us the fallibility of our systems of law making, law enforcement, and jurisprudence and that even the best-conceived legal systems must continually build civic faith by enhancing human freedom, satisfaction, and justice.

Similarly, the general awareness of the problems of poverty, unemployment, disease, drugs, and crime in the ghetto has led us to examine the quality of non-ghetto life in the city and the suburbs. Essentially the ghetto and the suburb are no-choice situations since it is unlikely that their respective residents can or would exchange places. There is considerable likelihood that ghetto children enjoy a freer and closer sense of community and live more intimately with their own and adult feelings than suburban children locked in their clean and cluttered compounds and cut off from intercourse with the adult community. We begin to see that the price we shall pay for the flight to the suburbs will be paid not only in the city but also in the suburbs. While suburban and insulated urban adults try to recapture a sense of humanity and pleasure in material possessions, encounter groups, sexual promiscuity, cocktail parties, and frantic

vacations, their children have discovered the easiest way of all to escape boredom, fear, and guilt and to arrest at least a fleeting sense of being alive--the use of drugs. Middle class parents should help the ghetto not only out of some abstract sense of human justice but also to earn the help of ghetto parents who can show them how to save their children. The ghetto children grow up in a world with most of the escapes the suburbs belatedly have discovered and the faith and purpose of many of these children is born of their conscious choice of life over death.

The insistent complaints of city and suburb and the conflict of individual and corporate values describe the need for profound changes in our personal, social, and national life. In the next section we consider the civic roles and institutional options we have for change in the seventies.

Options for Change: Individual Civic Styles

We have invented a typology of civic styles which locates the role choices in the contemporary panorama of political and social change. Civic styles distinguish internally the motivation and values informing our private lives and externally the motivation and values informing our social or public lives. We distinguish four civic styles: Private Man, Elite Man, Alienated Man, and Civic Man.

What motivates the Private Man is the need to carve out for himself, his family, and his small circle of friends a world which affords them protective intimacy, familiarity of manners and surroundings, fiscal solvency and security, and domestic tranquility undisturbed by the moral, political, and social dilemmas of the larger society. He is the modern epicurean, with little faith in the recuperative powers of sick mankind and society, trying to locate and preserve an isolated moment of calm and meaningfulness. Essentially, the Private Man has no public role because he limits his social participation to the routine enactment of job responsibilities and to the few sheltered political forays necessary to protect private interests and to vote. His commitment to flag, country, and political, social, and religious institutions is tenuous and confused and his certainty narrows to the palpable pleasures of his private world. His values are frequently middle class and conservative. He sees in change the erosion of what he holds dear and his first reaction to change is to secure the locks in his private domicile.

The Elite Man possesses an invincible conviction about the basic inequality of man and the compelling need to collect and exercise power. Before his mirror he projects the image of the man of destiny rather than choice, a man of mission rather than love, a man of uncommon foresight, talent, and will. The Elite Man attributes his superiority to various aristocratic sources--to an aristocracy of blood in the case of royalty and nobility, an aristocracy of wisdom and thought in the case of philosopher-kings and university professors, an aristocracy of wealth and entrepeneurial genius in the case of our industrial barons, an aristocracy of virtue and divine election in the case of particular religious sects, and an aristocracy of race and nationality in the case of the first decades of this century.

In his private life the Elite Man is often lonely, unable to surrender his supra-human demeanor for a moment of intimacy with others. Privately, he is

sometimes corrupt and decadent, attempting to obtain love and closeness through orgiastic self-indulgence. Elite Men devote their public lives to punitive or paternal domination of lesser men and to battling other Elite Men for power. They have a tragic view of public life; they believe that all Elite Men must fall beneath the boot of their young elitist successors. For the democratic ethic of human equality and mutuality, they substitute the Darwinian ethic of domination by and survival of the fittest species. In politics they may be paternalistic, unconscious of the oligarchic nature of their power or they may be radical or reactionary, projecting to their extremist opponents their own needs for power and control. Occasionally the Elite Man is the Private Man who enters the public sector, not only to participate in but also to impose his vision on the course of public events.

In our time the Alienated Man is often the person who believes in human freedom and self-fulfillment. His alienation lies in his rejection of the occupational and political worlds of corporate values and in his withdrawal from constructive change efforts. In his commune, home, or rural retreat he tries to build a micro-world of repose, decency, and mutual love and concern. The fierce concentration of his energies and fantasies on his small community often reaches explosive intensity and it becomes necessary to leave one commune to build another or to try again the larger society. Prolonged alienation is often the result of an unconscious moral elitism in which the Alienated Man fails to grant to others the generous impulses he has found in himself and the capacity of others to change as he has changed. Many Alienated Men are young people. Their alienation often takes an angry, political form and they try to destroy or reduce to absurdity the institutions which symbolize corporate values. In the role of political revolutionary, however, they are really Elite Men borrowing the rhetoric and the values of Alienated Men. For the Alienated Man by definition and by choice has no civic life. His conscious renunciation of public life is the result of greater moral clarity than we find in the Private Man, but like the Private Man he projects a shadowy, evanescent civic role.

The Civic Man finds personal freedom and gratification in intimate social relations with an increasingly diverse array of his fellow man. The high valuation he places on his own liberty and pleasure naturally and comfortably projects a high valuation for the liberty and pleasure of others. Whereas the Private Man seeks contentment by restricting his relationships to small, homogeneous circles which grow even smaller over the years, the Civic Man actively seeks and enjoys the diversity of talents, moods, and styles individual human beings have and moves in ever expanding social and political circles. The Civic Man has overcome the unconscious moral elitism of the Alienated Man because he believes that the exercise of options and the satisfaction of intimate social relations which enrich his own life also enrich the lives of all of us. By overcoming his fear of being less worthy than those he loves and admires and his guilt over the full and creative use of his talent and knowledge, he overcomes the psychological and social pitfalls of the Elite Man. The life view of the Civic Man encompasses human fallibility and death. But he learns every day how to use human error and tragedy to build new options for change which increase human freedom and satisfaction.

It is probably the Civic Man alone who does not suffer or need to suffer the schizophrenic experience of the Private, Elite, and Alienated Man who must live in unrelated and antagonistic public and private worlds. What is private and personal for the Civic Man are moments of temporary retreat for private

gratification, his most intimate associations, and for spinning thoughts and fantasies which energize his efforts to build a kinder and richer social world.

Civic education in the seventies should transform Private, Elitist, and Alienated Men into Civic Men. We must find ways which make it easier and more attractive for young people to step into than to step away from the life of the community. We shall explore later the ways the school and community can develop Civic Men.

Our typology of civic styles crystallizes the individual options we have for engaging in or disengaging ourselves from the problems and events of our time. In the section which follows we discuss our collective options for change: evolution, revolution, or reform.

Options for Change: Social Conflict Styles

We may classify conflict styles along two dimensions: (1) the amount of change or innovation groups envision for our present institutions and (2) the rate of change and, subsequently, the degree of conflict they are willing to endure to obtain change. The questions about the amount and rate of change also deal with how groups alternate between innovation and consolidation. We identify three conflict styles: evolutionary change, revolutionary change, and reform.

Advocates of evolutionary change favor the gradual introduction of innovation and the provision for consolidation at each innovative step. At the moral level evolutionists find innovation acceptable only when it occurs within the context of our traditional political and legal framework. They are usually institutionalists who see the preservation of present institutional contours more important than high responsiveness to what may often be fleeting whims and fancies of complaining individuals. They place high value on stability and, therefore, ordinarily avoid or quickly dampen conflict when it occurs. Conflict, they believe, results in institutional dysfunction and prevents the orderly growth of institutions. Conflict, like disease, is something you quickly get rid of. Ordinarily they do not see conflict as the result of institutional failure to meet the changing needs or a means of sharpening alternative courses of action for individuals and institutions. The desideratum of all institutional life is the functional harmony of essentially quiescent, happy individuals carrying out institutional missions in faithful and loyal ways.

Their response to student demands for changes in the schools and universities is often to substitute for the rigid and impersonal parentalism of the past the flexible and personal paternalism of an enlightened administrative gentry. Since they believe that institutional destinies should be entrusted to the hands of those in whom personal and institutional aspirations are united, they view with trepidation the sharing of school and college governance with students because of the divergence between what the students want or may want and what the institution is prepared to give. They believe that by the time the students become the administrators they will then understand the institution well enough to be entrusted with power.

The chief usefulness of the evolutionary position is the knowledge of how to consolidate change so that we avoid the anarchy of total and constant flux and transition.

The advocates of revolutionary change favor the total overthrow of present institutions and the erection of new ones on the site of the rubble. Revolutionists are more stylistic than substantive, favoring the theater of rebellion and the tactics of mass arousal over concrete institutional changes. Because they reject all contemporary institutional forms, they lack a historical frame-of-reference for describing their own innovations. They are contemptuous of the years of effort and care and the veneration individuals have bestowed upon institutions which now falter. They view institutions as huge, homogeneous monoliths and they ignore the many satisfactions institutions provide the many people who serve and are served by them.

Because revolutionists want to create entirely fluid political conditions they escalate conflict by rejecting multi-lateral methods of conflict resolution--negotiation, mediation, and arbitration. They look for and use for their targets those establishment people who oppose change as adamantly as they favor it and they stir up unrest on only the most perplexing and least immediately resolvable issues. When they precipitate and use physical violence, they are angels of death; revolutions kill people. Their freshness and intensity win the attention and the temporary allegiance of followers more tepid than they are. Their chief usefulness in the panorama of social change is to focus attention and conflict on general institutional failures and to legitimate the constructive, concrete change efforts of the reformer.

The reformer, as distinguished from the evolutionist and the revolutionist, sees in institutional change the means to enhance individual liberty and gratification. Whereas the others focus on the institution as the object of veneration or the <u>bête noir</u>, the reformer is first and last concerned with the human beings the institution should serve. The reformer practices the democratic ethic of individual mutuality and receptivity. His relationship with the institution in which he seeks change is a <u>partnership</u> with those who want change, in which the contractual terms are negotiable and mutually acceptable. He does not enter into this partnership expecting to impose his own will or pretending to have no will of his own. A partnership means that the negotiation occurs among equals, all parties gain, and all share the costs of the new enterprise. Each party contributes that which is harmonious with his own values, aspirations, and talent.

Conflict emerges among partners because the partners are human beings with differing moods and styles and value emphases. But because conflicts occur between individuals of mutuality, receptivity, and trust and in a context of common purpose and basic values, they are resolvable by the same method used in forming the partnership--negotiation. The conflict is beneficial because it sharpens the perception of choices and the probable choice consequences. Sick conflict, on the other hand, is the temporal indulgence of those who are not prepared to change or who want non-democratic changes which enhance their own and weaken the power of others.

The reformer never forgets that he is working with and for his fellow man. He is a Civic Man who always exercises his own options in ways which make it easier for others to exercise their own. He knows that within every institution individuals aspire to change and he begins and ends his work with individuals who now and later share change objectives. His relationships are reciprocal, open, and nonmanipulative.

We favor the reformer over the evolutionist and the revolutionist because his practices are most harmonious with democratic values and because we believe that he will be the man who gradually succeeds in humanizing contemporary institutions. By replacing the Machiavellian ethic of power with the democratic ethic of individual dignity he is not only more effective in winning change but also in winning changes that are morally desirable.

In the next section we want to describe the present school governance, and discuss the reform of the school and the community which we believe is necessary for the development of Civic Man.

Vertical School Governance

The model of school governance in the city and state of New York is typical of all states. School governance is a hierarchical triangle with decision-making concentrated at the apex and services to children and parents dispensed at the base. At the hierarchical apex is the state legislature, followed by the state Department of Education. The state Board of Regents, with 14 members, governs the Department of Education. This Board chooses the Commissioner of Education who, in practice, exercises many of the regents' legislative powers and is the single most powerful individual in the hierarchy.

The local Board of Education is under the state Department of Education. The registered voters of each school district elect the members of the local board which, in turn, sees that the local districts and schools meet state educational standards. Members of the local Board of Education are in legal status and in practice state officials carrying out state educational mandates. The local board hires a superintendent who enforces the various rules and standards, prepares courses of study, recommends textbooks, and supervises all school administrative personnel and operations. School principals are ordinarily selected from lists of certified names, usually of principals seeking advancement, and must be approved by the superintendent. It is at the state level, therefore, that rules are made about such matters as compulsory school attendance, length of the school day and year, required courses, content of courses, rules of conduct, and methods of discipline.

The hierarchy of decision-making power extends to the individual school which, in turn, has its own hierarchy. The school principal acts for the superintendent and has the final responsibility for all curricular and extra-curricular matters, all teachers and other school personnel, and for the conduct and discipline of students. The principal may and often does delegate some of his authority to assistant principals, deans, counselors, curriculum supervisors, school nurses, and so on. The teachers, in turn, are the representatives of the principal in their classrooms. They must carry out the policies, teach the curriculum, and enforce the rules of the principal. Principals vary in the amount of authority they delegate to teachers and teachers vary in the amount of authority they delegate to students. By tradition as well as by court decisions (Murphy, 1970) the school acts in loco parentis. Parents and other community members, apart from their voting for members of the local board and state legislature have no legal provision for participation in the school governance and are limited to a consultative role. At the bottom of the hierarchy are the students who have no political influence outside the school and usually cannot participate in governance inside the school.

There are informal sources of influence and power and pockets of choice and initiative which keep this monolithic system alive and somewhat responsive to change. The teacher's membership in unions and professional societies and tenure provide job and salary security and some autonomy in the selection and teaching of subject matter. Principals often delegate sufficient autonomy to department heads and teachers to make possible the introduction of new subject matter and teaching methods. District boards which organize sufficient community support can discourage the local Board of Education from engaging in an unrealistically rigorous enforcement of policies and encourage school personnel and teachers to make useful changes. Students, with or without community and teacher support, can dispute and refuse to conform to school policies and practice and win change through confrontation with school personnel. State and local boards of education can actively encourage "decentralization" so that decision-making power and responsibility combine in the same hands, particularly in the hands of students, parents, and teachers.

The triumph of the contemporary public school system in our cities lies in the ingenuity and intelligence of those officials, administrators, teachers, and students who often make an almost unworkable system work.

Horizontal School Governance

The civic education of high school students in the seventies should largely consist of their learning how to form partnerships with principals, teachers, and parents and taking more and more responsibility for their self-governance. The analysis of our data on student perceptions of conflict areas suggest these insights and guidelines for the reform of school governance (see Chapters II-VI):

1. Participation in decision-making is the almost universal expectation or demand of high school students.

2. Principals and teachers should provide more opportunities for students to make choices.

3. Students should have more opportunity to hear the decision-making processes of others.

4. Students should have help in articulating their own choices and in becoming aware of their own choice-making.

5. Principals and teachers should increase the number of negotiations attempted in resolving their conflicts with students.

6. The increased frequency of these negotiations would sharply reduce physical acts of violence on the part of students.

7. The present level of dissatisfaction in high school students with school governance makes the high school the best place to begin to change school governance.

School-Community Relations

The horizontal governance of the school should extend from partnerships with students to partnerships with parents and people in community organizations, including the church, business, and industry, who want to participate in the education of our children. Parents, for example, are very good teachers for their own children since they know these children so well. Closer school-community relations will make it possible for parents to have the materials, time, and assistance for teaching their children at home and in community centers, for older children to teach younger children, and for any community member or resource person with some useful talent or skill to teach the children inside or outside the school.

Presently the education of the child is encapsulated within the school building and there encapsulated within each classroom. The typical urban pattern of school-community relations is described in the following passage (Janowitz, p. 102):

> The typical pattern of contact with an individual family or parent has been essentially negative and even on occasion repressive. Direct day-to-day observation underlined the consistent pattern by which the public school in the slum community operated to keep parents from understanding its educational program. Parents had to live with a lack of adequate information and with much misinformation about school procedures and the obligations of the school authorities toward their students. Inquiries by parents were generally discouraged by arbitrarily limiting office hours, by rude and officious behavior toward parents, and by creating a climate in which youngsters inhibited their parents from making inquiries since they have come to believe that such inquiries would "make trouble" for them. School authorities took the initiative when they wished and this was mainly the occasion of pronounced misbehavior. The "horror" stories that circulated were not exaggerations or isolated cases but reflected operating procedures. The bulk of parents were unaware of the names of the teachers and never had contact with them. Children could be arbitrarily suspended from school for periods of many months without any recourse of appeal. Even when new programs were initiated they were frequently created arbitrarily, without regard for the realities and pressures of family life.

It is possible that much of the information and many skills the school tries to provide, students more easily and attractively acquire in the setting where they are used. Libraries, museums, and music and media centers are richer and more convenient storehouses of knowledge and the arts than schools are or need to be. Much of the time the student now spends within the school building could more profitably be spent in these facilities. Many skills, clerical, computer, medical, laboratory, legal, mechanical, and so on, could be acquired in the places they are used and developed--the office, the department store, the computer facility, the hospital, the research facility, the courts, the studio, and the shop. Not only would students learn the appropriate, useful skills but also they could render services to the enterprise in exchange for what they are learning.

The school buildings, in response to both student and community interests and needs, could become learning and service centers, easily accessible to both

adults and young people, for rendering or obtaining the wide range of services every community needs. Spanish-speaking parents could use the school at one time to learn English while at other times they assume responsibility for feeding the children and adults in the school lunchrooms. We may transform the encapsulated school into a community center which loosely assembles medical, health, educational, recreational and meeting facilities to make it easier for parents and children to contribute to and obtain all of these services.

Anything we can do to unlock school doors and restore to students and the community freedom of movement to and from and within the school will breathe new life into learning and build a vital tradition of community service.

The New Civic Education

Here is an example of the new civic education. It deals with a real school-community problem, the building of a new school, and involves in real decision-making and participation representatives from the school and community, including students, teachers, counselors, principal, parents, and members of community organizations. The Franklin Improvement Program Committee (the FIPC) of Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem is developing plans for a new comprehensive high school. The members of the committee are members of the Parent Teachers Association, Union Settlement, the student government organization, the United Federation of Teachers, Teachers College, the United Tenants' Council, and the school administration. After several months of study, the FIPC issued a report on the needs of the community and the school which cannot be met by present services and facilities. The next committee task was to secure funds from the Board of Education for planning and building.

In New York City the Board of Estimate decides which projects should be funded and the amount of funding. The FIPC was not certain of the procedure for presenting its request to the Board of Estimate. First, as one member suggested, the FIPC presented its request to the district Board of Education. The district board directed the committee to write to the secretary of the Board of Estimate to reserve speaking time. The secretary of the Board designated the day and hour the FIPC was to appear.

Some FIPC community members were eager to have more students and community residents know about the forthcoming Board meeting. The committee decided that the students were to prepare a flier to be distributed to all students and, through them, to their parents. With the help of a teacher, a counselor, and some individuals from Teachers College, students determined the wording of the flier, an art class designed it, and a leadership class arranged for its distribution. The flier announced an open meeting of the FIPC prior to its appearance before the Board of Estimate.

The scheduled speakers appeared before the Board of Estimate and argued for the new school and the funds to plan and build it. Before this august body, students and principal and parents, in a rare show of unity, described the problems of their school and community and answered the questions of the Board members. The courage and purpose of the community and students genuinely moved the Board members. East Harlem people were at last asking for what they wanted and needed and not waiting for the next act of paternalistic benevolence. But most important of all, the students had participated in making a series of decisions

vital to their own and their community interests. They learned about the processes of governance under the best possible conditions--in satisfying their own vital needs.

What our children learn about freedom, pleasure, equality, mutuality, justice, receptivity is less likely to be what they read in the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Gettysburg Address, civic textbooks, and what they hear adults preach about civic responsibility. What our children learn about all these virtuous abstractions is what they truly experience in their relations with adults. For it is what we do and fail to do with and for our children that opens and closes the options they have for building these abstractions into the concrete reality of their relations with each other and with us. The cry against adult hypocrisy is evidence enough that young people see the discrepancy between what we preach and what we do and that they find the inconsistency very confusing.

There is a profound fallacy which permeates the social science and pedagogical literature on attitudes, feelings, emotions, and civic education. The fallacy is the pathetic assumption that we have found or soon will find those instructional materials and teaching interventions which will guarantee the production of "appropriate" student attitudes and "appreciations." Since we are so successful at producing automobiles and stereophonic sets and music, why should we fail to produce proper attitudes?

What psychotherapy recalls for the participating individual is that he always had and always will have feelings and that he has often consciously and unconsciously concealed these feelings from himself and others in order to meet demands he was too fearful or guilty to question or deny. In order to recover his own feeling, so that conscious feeling permeates his thought and action, the individual must examine the demands imposed on him and choose to honor those which increase his options and his self-gratification. The essential point is this: neither the participating therapist nor individual can manufacture, instill, change, or in any way manipulate feeling. Feeling is the spontaneous ambience emerging from the individual's weighing, meeting, and denying many demand-options. When the individual arrives at a set of options and a way of changing options which he finds freeing and fulfilling, he is able to live with both the vulnerability and enjoyment of his feelings.

Nothing could be more manipulative and foolish for the school than the attempt to produce or change attitudes. The schools can, however, change the demands it makes on students and shift the responsibility for making choices more and more to the students. This is what we mean when we say we enjoy freedom. We are saying what is universally true for mankind, we enjoy doing those things we choose for ourselves and which we do in our own way.

Perhaps the clearest statement we can make about the new civic education emerges from our Manual of Objectives and Guidelines for High School Civic Education (see Chapter IX):

1. The citizen participates in the decision-making processes of his society.

2. The citizen makes use of alternative courses of action. If he finds no viable options open, he creates new alternatives for democratic action.

3. The citizen analyzes courses of action for their democratic bases, feasibility, and anticipated and actual consequences.

4. The citizen employs negotiation, mediation, and arbitration in resolving conflicts.

5. The citizen understands and analyzes issues from viewpoints other than his own.

6. The citizen sees democratic issue in the problems of others, as well as in his own life.

7. The citizen recoghizes the value and utilizes the power of group action.

8. The citizen distinguishes personal issues and conflicts from institutional issues and conflicts, and attacks the two accordingly.

9. The citizen grasps and acts on the principles involved in concrete problems in democracy.

10. The citizen relates his principles to relevant incidents.

As useful as they undoubtedly are, the heart of civic education does not lie in the subject matter of social studies courses, in curricular materials produced in university research and development centers, in "the structure of knowledge" of the social sciences, in new instructional methods for promoting "discovery," "problem-solving," and "inquiry," or even in field trips and community surveys which still confine the student to the role of passive observer and intruder. The new civic education can and will occur only as the school and community help the student consciously distinguish and exercise options for rendering school-community services which transform narrow private lives into liberal civic lives.

Bibliography

1. DeCecco, John P. Civic Participation in a Crisis Age. Volume II of Civic Education for the Seventies: The Alternative to Reaction and Revolution. New York: Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, 1969.

2. Fox, Michael. Esquire, February 1970, Vol. LXXXIII.

3. Janowitz, Morris. Institution Building in Urban Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

4. Murphy, Deann. "Case Study of Due Process in Franklin K. Lane High School." New York: Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, 1970. Mimeograph.

5. Westin, Alan F. and Associates. "Student Protest and the American School: Prospects for Conflict and Change in the 1970's." New York: Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, 1970. Mimeograph.

Chapter II

A STUDY OF SCHOOLS IN THE GREATER NEW YORK AREA METHODOLOGY: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

John DeCecco, Arlene Richards, Raymond Smith, Josephine Harrison

Introduction

The joyless Moratorium crowd, demonstrating their support for an immediate end to the Vietnamese War in Bryant Park on October 15, 1969, demanded to be heard. Like all crowds, this one had no ability to say anything complex or refined. A crowd can shout. It cannot negotiate. A crowd can express global, undifferentiated feelings; it cannot make nice logical distinctions. A crowd cannot accomplish a logical sequence of rational acts. Some crowds are volatile; they can turn into mobs unexpectedly. They can leap into flaming riots when carefully prewarmed and ignited, deliberately or accidentally, at just the right moment. Other crowds are stolid. They present an immovable mass of unweildy flesh resisting an event they see as unjust. The resistant crowd is the political unit employed increasingly through the 1960's to counterbalance the complexed, rational, clearly defined inhumanity of computerized bureaucratic decision-making agencies. The particular crowd in New York's Bryant Park on October 15 was just such a unit of political force. The people were there to react to the confused thinking that had brought the United States to its current position in the war, to strengthen their own convictions by the realization of finding them shared with so many others, and to attempt to change policy by changing the attitudes of their representatives. Some of the people in that crowd could have argued logically about their attitudes. Some could not. But in a crowd, the feeling is the essential thing, and the people were there to share in a common expression of feeling and concern.

High school students were a large part of the crowd on that day. New York hip with flowing hair, yet All-American practical in blue jeans, they shared the feelings, exercised political leverage, and got some civic education never provided in schools. They were learning things that could not be taught because they had not happened yet. They were learning about political action and participation by participating in political action. Participation is the critical issue in American democracy for the 1970's.

One high school student who had participated in gathering of petition signatures for that moratorium said of it:

"I was really expecting everybody to sign up but a lot of people didn't. They asked us how old we were. Then they said it was just what they expected, a bunch of fifteen-year-old kids trying to tell them what to do. They wouldn't listen to anything we had to say. But a lot more signed. There are a lot of people against the war. I guess it really did some good that we went."

One can contrast this level of sophisticated observation and feeling of satisfaction derived from participation in a national political issue with the resentment engendered in a second high school student by the following situation in which there was no opportunity to participate in the political process:

"The G. O. president nominating [process] is not democratic. In this school, we the students don't nominate a G. O. president. An appointed nominating committee selects our candidates. I think that is unfair. I feel that the student body should be able to nominate persons for the position instead of having someone do it for us!!!"

The attitudes and probable civic behavior evoked in a third high school student, quoted below, show what happens when participation is denied and the high school student stops trying to participate in the political processes that affect his own life.

"I think this whole thing is stupid. The kids that are sitting in the main lobby now are very ridiculous. They are not going to get what they want if they sit there all day...." "I don't think the police have a right to tell us to get inside the building or we will be arrested. We really have no freedom now and never will again. The only reason I'm not in the lobby now is because I think it's worthless...."

The opportunity for participation means to the first student a chance to do something meaningful. Something so meaningful that he expresses willingness to endure the tirades of irate adults and go on with his effort to affect a change in a political process. The second student feels rebellious because he is being denied the opportunity to participate and demands a change in the institution which will allow him to participate. The third is completely "turned off." He is convinced of the futility of even trying to change his school.

Each of the three students has learned from his own experience something about participation in politics. Each has had an involvement which contributed to his own "civic education." These are typical complaints, sometimes merely stated and sometimes more vigorously acted upon by many young people today. They bear out our position that political life on some level is a sine qua non of civic education.

The present study was designed to explore students' awareness of the democratic alternatives in their own schools.

The first product of the project, Civic Participation in a Crisis Age, (DeCecco, 1969, in Volume II), is an analysis of the political and social forces within American society in the 1970's which magnify the difficulty of and increase the need for civic education in the high schools in the coming decade. The rest of the project provided empirical evidence for the need for participation in the civics curriculum and indicated directions in which participation may lead. In particular, the data pointed up those issues students feel the need to participate in now, their cognitive and attitudinal stances vis-a-vis the situations they find themselves in and their perceptions of the possibility for resolution of dilemmas in democracy arising in those situations.

Data Collection

To provide an empirical basis for the themes and categories defined in the substantive document, Civic Participation in a Crisis Age, the validation necessary for writing the civic education objectives, students were asked to describe "dilemma incidents" they had experienced which left them with at least

two alternative responses and in which the "democratic thing to do" was not clear. The data were obtained from the "silent majority," ordinary students generally in regular social studies courses, not from student activists or students who published underground newspapers.

The interview form was developed in the fall of 1968 and administered from March 1 to May 15 in the spring, 1969. The form is reproduced here as Appendix A. For the sake of brevity in the Appendix, the space in which students were to write has been reduced. Students were given ample space to describe their incident, including a second sheet if desired. For the use of non-English speaking high school students in the New York City area, the interview form was prepared also in Spanish and French. The data were coded during June, July and August and processed for computer analysis in August and September. Data analyses continued into early 1970.

The interview form was pretested with a group of school administrators, teachers and students and revised to minimize the flaws found in the original version. The basic version asked for an incident illustrating a dilemma in democratic behavior, leaving open the question of whether this was to be an incident in which the respondent felt that he had been successful or not. This basic version was intended to be neutral enough to elicit replies expressing satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the outcome about equal. In addition, a version designed to elicit incidents in which students perceived themselves successful was prepared. This was considered to be necessary as a supplement to the original form because the original produced incidents of non-success almost exclusively.

Another version in which it was explicitly asked what the person(s) on the other side of the conflict might have said was used to determine whether the original version had elicited one-sided accounts of incidents because of its wording or because of the structure of the respondent's thought. Another version of the interview form was prepared when it became apparent that most respondents were not describing a dilemma, but were complaining of an injustice instead. The version was written to elicit dilemmas and discourage complaints. It asked for a description of the incident on one page and a comment on what the person(s) on the other side of the conflict might have said on the next. The physical separation of the two sides of the story was intended to help respondents to include both sides.

We collected 6,783 written interviews with urban and suburban elementary and junior and senior high school students, comprising an extensive mix of socio-economic status, race, nationality, religion, and school entrance requirements. The interviews were conducted by classroom groups, except in the elementary schools where individual interviews were used. In one school students were shown a videotape to make the presentation as uniform as possible (See Chapter VIII below on films). The examples had been chosen from actual events reported in student underground newspapers in the previous weeks. Students were urged to participate. They were assured that their privacy would not be invaded and that nothing they wrote would be used later against them. To insure this privacy, no identifying data were asked for.

After writing their dilemma incidents, students then were asked to check their incidents for completeness and to classify them by ranks from 1 to 4 along

the four civic participation codes as outlined in the initial position paper: Dissent, Equality, Due Process and Decision-making.

Interviewers for the project were college and first year, white and black graduate students. A description of the interviewers, their selection, training and reactions to the project experience are given as Appendix B.

The project was conducted largely at Teachers College, Columbia University. Data gathering involved visits to more than thirty schools, listed in Appendix C. The schools under study were all in the Greater New York Metropolitan region, except for Gratz High School in Philadelphia. For those schools in which the number of respondents was large, some characteristics of the schools themselves are given as Appendix D. In one case, at Mineola High School and Mineola Junior High, all the students in the school building at a particular time on one day were asked to describe incidents. At New Rochelle, our visit fortuitously coincided with a student protest in which a number of students refused to attend classes and police entered the school grounds to restore order. Our team interviewed students who were not on strike but who were quietly attending classes.

A second urban-suburban comparison was made that differed from the cross-sectional study by comparing students rather than schools. There was so much difficulty in gaining access to schools that schools were included on the basis of readiness of entry alone, i.e., the cooperation of the principal. Within the limits of possible entry, some suburban communities of high socio-economic status like Hastings, Woodlands and Sleepy Hollow were sampled. Suburban communities of middle socio-economic status were represented by Mineola and New Rochelle. Freeport, a suburban community with a black low socio-economic group was included. The urban schools sampled drew most of their population from low socio-economic groups. This difference in socio-economic status between urban and suburban schools seemed to reflect a genuine difference in which groups attend urban and suburban public schools and did not necessarily imply sampling error. Rather than despair over the inability to draw and examine a sample of high socio-economic status in an urban setting or a low socio-economic status in a suburban setting, the limitations of the sample were accepted as reflecting the state of American society as represented in the greater New York area in 1969.

High schools with black students--either an all-black student population or a large percentage of black students--were compared. Of the seven in our study, five were urban schools and two were suburban. Of particular interest in this comparison was the situation at Franklin K. Lane High School which, during the period of our data-gathering, experienced severe violence among the students themselves. Since then rioting has periodically broken out. Freeport High School has a Black Studies Program which was supposedly developed to meet black student needs. Our interviews at Freeport were only with the students in the Black Studies Program. In the comparison with high schools with black students, we have paid particular attention to the reporting from these two schools because of their individually unique situations.

Coding

The protocols were coded by trained coders for Civic Participation, Content, Psychological Process, Conflict Resolution and Affect categories. The

results of the coding were tabulated and conclusions were drawn by the Center staff. The Code Book that was developed appears as Appendix E. It is an important document for those attempting to duplicate our research.

The coding system was devised to reduce information from the interviews to statistically treatable categories. The civic participation codes enabled us to determine level of understanding of civic participation shown by the respondents. The developmental process codes revealed how students saw the conflict situations they found themselves enmeshed in. Using hypotheses derived from Piaget and other developmental psychological theorists, we were able to determine the present level of development of students in the public schools with respect to how they saw the moral dilemmas of democratic behavior. The conflict resolution codes clarified the kinds of resolutions students have perceived as attempts to deal with conflicts in democracy in their schools. The affect codes were of two kinds--first, categories of tension level and satisfaction; and second, adjective lists. In addition, since the attempt to characterize affect by coding seemed inadequate to the coders, we attempted to supplement the affect description with an impressionistic synthesis of feelings expressed in the responses.

Civic Participation Codes

The civic participation codes were derived from political and social theory described in the basic document Civic Participation in a Crisis Age. The complex ideas expressed in that document were translated into a set of four categories which could be described and explained to high school students in single sentence definitions. They were derived from Professor Alan Westin's theory of civic participation. His two categories of choice, dissent and decision-making, were elected. They were then explained to a panel of high school students, teachers and administrators. After some discussion of the terms and clarification of the definitions, the panel members were asked to rank taped incidents. When good agreement on the meaning of the terms had been reached, the categories were added to the interview form so that students could categorize their own incidents. This served to make the interview something of a learning situation for the respondents. It also made it clearer for us to see how closely the students' understanding of the categories of civic participation approximated the Center's formulation of the political scientists' view.

Content Codes

The content codes, unlike the participation codes, were derived empirically from the data. Staff members read replies to the questionnaires until there were no new categories derived from reaching another hundred questionnaires. At that point, about 2,000 questionnaires had been read. The content categories were further refined in the course of teaching the coders how to use them.

Forty-one categories were devised by this process, but for greater reliability in interpretation they were grouped into six major content categories:

1. Issues pertaining to courses and curriculum
2. Political issues which pertained to political units larger than the school

3. Issues involving the infractions of legal codes of units larger than the school

4. Issues involving aspects of school organization other than academic issues

5. Out-of-school social issues involving peers and adult society, but not in legal or political contexts

6. Issues of individual rights involving authorities, mainly in school, or involving others outside of school but which became problems because they involved e.g. parental objections to long hair based on school rules against it.

Appendix F lists the components of the six major categories that were finally derived.

Categories were then selected for comparison on the basis of theoretical and practical values of the comparisons. Out-of-school social issues were investigated in the cross-sectional comparison to determine whether students become less involved in peer quarrels as they get older. This was intended to confirm the Havighurst-Erickson (1949) idea that a developmental interest in peer relationships should be more evident at junior high than at high school age. Political issues were compared with out-of-school social issues in an attempt to support Piaget's idea (1958) that adolescents become interested in larger, more inclusive social organizations as they mature.

Issues of individual rights and non-academic school issues were grouped together for a practical purpose: How much of the conflict perceived by students could be dealt with through the governance of the school itself? These were the categories which consisted of those areas of school life that are governed by school rules but are not technical or academic issues. For example, racial conflict in school, the right to use school facilities like the gym or mimeograph machine, and privacy in lockers were issues in these categories. Issues of either a social or political nature which do not occur in the school were excluded from these categories as were issues involving material to be included in the curriculum, teaching methods, and other issues considered to be within special professional competencies of the teacher and school administrator.

Psychological Process Codes: Interpersonal Involvement

A. Developmental Process: These codes were derived from theories of child and adolescent development and from conflict resolution models. The interpersonal involvement scales were derived from Piaget and Inhelder's* work on decentering in adolescents. The process codes tabulated, for both the perceived protagonist(s) and the perceived antagonist(s):

---

*The theory of decentering is more fully elaborated in "The Development of the Interpersonal Aspect of Political Socialization," which follows in the Empirical Studies, Chapter VII.

1. personal/impersonal

2. individual/group

3. alternative courses of action

4. whether these alternatives involved conviction and/or expediency.

Correlations between categories <u>within</u> the process code helped in answering such questions as:

1. Does a student's ability to see options go along with personal involvement in a conflict?

2. Is moral level of a conflict resolution associated with the size of the group involved in a conflict?

3. Is the use of negotiation associated with increased perception of alternatives?

Correlations between the codes related the content of issues to the modes of resolution used, the civic participation issues to the processes of their perception and resolution, and to the affect they leave in their wake.

B. <u>Protagonist and Antagonist</u>: The four aspects of interpersonal involvement that could be induced from our data were investigated. They are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2. Figure 1 shows the aspects of interpersonal involvement derived from the student's description of the protagonist in his incident; Figure 2 shows those aspects of interpersonal involvement derived from the student's description of the antagonist. Figure 1 shows the dimensions here labeled "Distance and Group Size." Figure 2 shows those labeled "Relative Status and Personification." By comparing Figures 1 and 2, it can be seen that they depict parallel dimensions of interpersonal involvement.

FIGURE 1

Interpersonal Involvement of Writer and Protagonist of the Incident

<u>Group Size</u>	Distance: Near	Distance: Far
Individual	I	He
Group	We	They

FIGURE 2

Interpersonal Involvement of Writer and Antagonist of the Incident

Personification		Relative Status: Near	Relative Status: Far
	Individual	Peer	Authority
	Group	Peer group	Institution

C. Distance: One aspect of the ability to comprehend other points of view is represented by interpersonal distance in this study. Distance was operationally defined as using "He" or "They" as the protagonist of the incident when asked to describe a dilemma in democracy.* It is the horizontal dimension shown in Figure 1. The larger the proportion of children at an age level discussing issues in terms of "He" and "They" the more are capable of seeing things from another point of view.

D. Group Size: Piaget (1958) emphasized the importance of "social roles and scales of values derived from social interaction (and no longer by coordination of exchanges which they maintain with the physical environment and other individuals)." The hypothesis is that the individual relates more to larger groups as he matures or perceives groups in more abstract terms. Both were investigated in the present study: (1) relating to larger groups was investigated in terms of group size, as shown in Figure 1; (2) relating to a more abstract conception of groups was investigated in the group versus institution dimension shown in Figure 2. One hypothesis derived from this theoretical statement was that older students would be more likely to describe the protagonist of their incidents as groups. Operationally, the proportion of students describing incidents in terms of "I" or "He" was taken to represent the proportion of students' thinking of individuals rather than groups. The proportion describing incidents in terms of "We" or "They" was taken to represent the proportion thinking of groups rather than individuals. This is the vertical dimension in Figure 1. This hypothesis was tested in the Cross-Sectional Comparison, Urban-Suburban Comparison, and Educational Level included in "The Development of the Interpersonal Aspect of Political Socialization."

---

*The possibility that the contrast could have been structured as I versus (We, He, They) was considered and discarded on two grounds. First, it would confound the two linguistically distinct qualities of person and number which correspond to our distance and group size. Second, it is one of the great tasks of adolescence to define one's relationship with his group, to separate one's own interests from those of the other members of one's group. If the adolescent has not yet clearly separated I or We, it seemed the more conservative procedure would be to see him as achieving distance only when he spoke of the clearly differentiated He or They.

E. Relative Status: Another test of the likelihood of seeing situations from others' perspectives would be discussing incidents with people socially distant from the writer. If the incident involved a peer as antagonist, the writer would be said to be less distant. This is the horizontal dimension in Figure 2. Peers were presumed to be less distant than adults for high school students. Therefore, if a larger percentage of high school students mentioned conflicts with adults, this would be evidence that they were involved with more distant people and thus with more diverse perspectives. This dimension of interpersonal involvement was labeled "Relative Status."

F. Personficiation: Finally, it was assumed that involvement in conflicts with individual persons was a manifestation of a less mature outlook than involvement with larger groups. Personification is the vertical dimension in Figure 2. The proportion of incidents involving conflicts with an institution could thus be seen as an index of the social maturity of the respondents.

Alternatives and Convictions

A. Alternatives: The conflict resolution codes were developed from social science theory. To make choices, one must perceive alternatives. The moral responsibility for one's actions depends on one's choices in the situation in which one acts. No one should be held accountable for doing one thing if he could not do otherwise in the situation. To translate the ideals of democracy into democratic behavior, the citizen must be in a situation where democratic alternatives are available and he can perceive that they are open to him.

A student was said to have perceived alternatives for his action in an incident when he wrote in a hypothetical mode, i.e., using such constructs as "chose to," "refused to...and did...," "would have," "couldn't decide whether or not I should," "had planned to..., but." If the student articulated any alternatives for the protagonist of the incident he reported, he was said to have perceived alternatives, even though he indicated that one of the alternatives was impossible or unacceptable. Using the Piagetian hypothesis that as people mature morally, convictions or ideals tend to influence their moral choices more than when they are less mature, the investigation attempted to assess frequency of moral choices based on ideal in contrast to pragmatic choices.

B. Conviction: If a student could perceive alternatives, his incident was then coded to see whether convictions were involved in the protagonist's decision. Convictions were said to be involved when the student used phrases indicating personal or moral value judgments, i.e., "knew what was right," "knew it would have been the right thing to do, but," "was a sin, but," "knew it was wrong," "knew I should, but," "couldn't betray a friend," "but I believed."

Like the other codes, the conflict resolution codes were added to, clarified and refined in the process of training coders to use them.

Conflict Resolution I: Negotiation versus Decision by Authority

A. Decision-making: Since students had been asked to write an incident in which there was a problem in democracy, the democratic processes of conflict resolution would presumably be discussed. Therefore, all theoretical categories of democratic decision-making that one could expect to be used in a democratic

school were investigated to determine how democracy works in the schools as seen through the eyes of students. The overall results indicated few modes of conflict resolution occurred often enough in the incidents described to warrant detailed analysis. In the cross-sectional analysis, the modes of conflict resolution generally fell into the non-violent modes and the violent modes. The violent modes comprised any use of force; non-violent modes comprised negotiation, decision by authority, formal vote, mediation, arbitration, verbal threats and petition. The uses of force are discussed in a separate section. Non-violent modes are explored immediately below.

For the most part, non-violent modes of conflict resolution were so rare that any statistical analysis of their use was impossible. The only non-violent modes used frequently enough to warrant further analysis were negotiation and decision by authority. Conflict resolution categories were not mutually exclusive. The same incident could be coded as many times as necessary to record all modes of conflict resolution attempted. The codification was not limited to successful or terminating attempts at resolution, but included any means of resolution attempted. Thus, the very small numbers of reported attempts at mediation and arbitration and petition reflected the lack of any attempt rather than a lack of success when these methods of conflict resolution were used.

B. Negotiation was the category used to describe any attempt at resolution by talking with the other people involved in the conflict. It was considered that negotiation had been used whether the conflict was actually resolved by talks among the people involved or the resolution was finally accomplished by some other means. The definition of negotiation was liberal. By contrast, a strict definition of decision by authority was adopted. Decision by authority referred only to those cases in which the conflict was actually terminated by the authority decision.

Examples of conflict resolution using negotiation were given to the coders. Some examples were:

"From discussing this problem we solved it by taking it apart and figuring what we could do."

"The whole class voted to go on the trip."

"Even though only half the class voted we still had to come to school."

"We talked it over among ourselves before reaching any conclusion."

"The whole family met to decide what we should do."

Decision by authority was illustrated:

"The judge passed sentence."

"Our president told us no..."

Conflict Resolution II: Use of Force

Force was defined, for coding purposes, as any actual use of physical force, coercion or restraint. Excluded from use of force were threats or other verbal preludes to physical force and physical activity, unless it was overtly stated that the activity was seen as an assault on others with hostile, coercive intent. The categories of reported use of force were compiled separately for peers, authorities and subordinates. Force from peers included any use of force by one student or group of students toward another. Use of force by authority was coded only when actual physical restraint was involved; use of force by subordinates included any use of force by students directed against either school administrators, teachers, or school property. The total use of force category thus included any physical assault or restraint by any party to the conflict.

Affect Codes

The affect codes were developed from some simple notions of satisfaction-dissatisfaction and raised or lowered levels of tension. It was followed by an affect description because coders felt that the simple division missed all of the subtle, complex, and important dimensions of affect in the protocols. Attempts were made to draw up an adjective checklist which could be used to describe the expressed affect in a comprehensive yet reliable way. The coders finally settled on a checklist, but found it was not quantifiable. Therefore, a descriptive comparison was developed. The conclusions drawn from this descriptive comparison are included in the appropriate sections of results and conclusions in following chapters.

A. Outcome: Outcome of the incident described by the student was evaluated by coders. The outcome was to be judged as "good," "bad," "mixed" or "unclear." It was "good" if the student expressed satisfaction; "bad" if he expressed dissatisfaction; "mixed" if he expressed some of each and "unclear" if he expressed neither. Some examples of good outcome were:

"We all thought that it was a fair way of solving the problem."

"I happily agreed with my teacher."

B. Tension Level: Tension level of the incident described by the student was evaluated separately from outcome by coders. Tension level was obviously closely related to outcome, but was judged separately to determine whether there might be bad outcomes leading to apathy on the part of students rather than to a raised tension level. Tension level was said to be "raised" when the student used expressions indicating greater anger, increased likelihood of further action or intention of escalating the conflict. Tension level, in this sense, is similar to the physical concept of kinetic energy in that it is a gauge of increased likelihood of greater release of energy in future transformations of potential into actual motion.

Examples of bad outcome were:

"The decision was unfair."

"I was so mad at the school that I never wanted to go back."

Mixed outcome was coded for such examples as:

"The reactions to the decision were mixed."

"The people who voted against going to school still did not want to come even though the majority voted for coming to school."

Unclear outcomes were coded for:

"That was the way the problem was solved."

"After the fight everyone forgot about the issue."

Tension level was said to be raised when the incident ended with such quotes as:

"And now the other people on the block are disgusted with the way they are keeping the house and realized the Negro would have been a better choice."

It was lowered when statements such as the following were made:

"When the new teacher came the class was quieter and we learned more."

"Now that we have a place to practice everybody is much happier."

Tension level was said to be unchanged for the following sample quotations:

"Even after the election we still have the problem."

"The new principal hasn't changed a thing."

Data Analysis

The responses were classified by school, grade and interviewer.

Reliability: By a process of random selection using a table of random numbers, 193 responses were selected for the reliability analysis. Each was coded by a different coder and the codings were compared. Results of this analysis can be found in the Overall Results chapter.

A cross-sectional comparison of schools for each code was made, using two suburban and two urban samples. Mineola High School and Mineola Junior High formed one cross-sectional suburban sample and Hastings High School and Hastings Junior High formed another. Brandeis High School, Joan of Arc Junior High School and Public School 165 (an elementary school) formed one cross-sectional urban sample while Hunter's Senior and Junior High Schools formed the other. Urban-suburban comparisons were made by geographic and school-level groups rather than school-by-school.

To use the four participation categories as the organizing principles for a new curriculum, it was decided to determine whether the categories were:

1. sufficiently reliable

2. better understood by politically aware adults than by school children

3. different in frequency of occurrence in the schools. (If the categories were better understood by adults it would make sense to attempt to bring students up to the level of politically aware adults.

For devising a new curriculum for different levels and kinds of schools, it would be useful to know whether the categories were:

4. better understood by high school than by junior high or elementary school students

5. used differently by urban and suburban students, which might determine what kinds of curriculum would meet their needs.

Question 1 on reliability represented an attempt to increase the number and variety of concepts used to analyze the data. Their presence in this respect indicated our reluctance to rely exclusively on the civic participation codes in analyzing the civic behavior of students.

The Urban-Suburban analysis was an attempt to answer questions 2 and 4 on developmental political awareness by comparing adult coders with students, and question 5 on the differences between urban and suburban students.

Questions 1, 2, and 3 are answered in the Overall Report; questions 2, 3, and 4 in the Cross-Sectional study, and questions 1, 2, 4, and 5 in the Urban-Suburban comparisons.

Civic Participation: The students' rankings were tabulated for each of the major political science categories: Equality, Dissent, Decision-making and Due Process. They were asked to assign the number 1 to the most pertinent category and number 4 to the least appropriate. Subsequently, coders were asked to perform the same ranking procedure without consulting the students' responses beforehand. Each response was classified as an incident or non-incident, but only incidents were analyzed.

Differences between coder rankings and respondent rankings could have been due to (a) the respondents' imperfect understanding of the categories; (b) inherent weaknesses in the categories themselves, or (c) the ambiguity of the incident being coded. Fortunately, the protocols received from one high school permitted us to test these alternatives. Two conflict situations were mentioned by many students: Snowdays and Midterms. Two hundred forty students wrote about Snowdays and another 200 about Midterms. The Snowday incidents told of the school principal's arbitrary decision to use several days of the Spring vacation to make up for time lost during an earlier snow storm. The protocols were generally about the arbitrariness of the decision (Decision-making) and sometimes about possible student defiance (Truancy) of that decision which, by the Project's definition would be Dissent. Midterms was a slightly more complicated issue. The principal made an arbitrary decision to institute midterm examinations. The students

objected to this departure from previous practice. Many students reported that some of their peers circulated a petition to protest the decision. Thus, Dissent was more overt in this incident than in the Snowdays issue. In addition, those responsible for the circulation of the petition were put on probation by the administration.

We examined all the protocols as follows: When it became apparent that we had a significant number of protocols on Snowdays and Midterms, the coders were asked to identify them by writing the appropriate title on each protocol. Lists were then made for Snowdays and Midterms containing the protocol number, student rankings and coder rankings for each protocol. On the basis of these lists we were able to determine the distribution of rankings from 1 to 4 assigned by respondents and coders. In addition to the overall distribution it was also possible on a protocol-by-protocol comparison to determine the frequency of coder agreement with respondent rankings. Finally, we grouped rankings of 1 and 2, tabulated the distribution of 1 or 2 rankings by students and tabulated the number of 1 or 2 rankings given by coders which agreed with the student rankings.

Of the 239 protocols designated Snowdays by coders, the respondents ranked participation categories on 166. (This latter number included instances where only 1 or a check was put to a participation category and the others were left unmarked.) Coders agreed with the respondents 119 out of 166 times, or 61.69% of the time. The agreement was exceptionally high on the issue of Decision-making. For Dissent, the overall rate of agreement was 219/272 or 80.51% of the time. In 95% of the cases where the respondents assigned 1 or 2 for Dissent and Decision-making (which constituted over 80% of their 1 and 2 rankings) coders agreed with them.

Similar tabulations were made on the Midterm protocols. When we compared the frequency of agreement of coders' 1 or 2 rankings with the respondents, coders agreed 240 out of 304 times with the respondents, or about 78.95% of the time. Comparing Snowdays and Midterms, the coder/student rate of agreement was similar. Both coders and respondents agreed that for Midterms, both Dissent and Due Process were important and they also agreed that for Snowdays Decision-making was easily the most important. In certain situations it cannot be said "objectively" that an incident is primarily that of, for example, Dissent or Decision-making. A practical application of our findings is that students should not be given the impression that an incident can be simply categorized; rather, it should be examined with the understanding that more than one category or more than one issue of democratic behavior may be involved and that it is necessary to use more than one category to characterize an incident.

Content: Frequencies were tabulated for each of the six consolidated content categories: Courses and Curriculum, Political Issues, Illegal Acts, Non-academic School Issues, Out-of-school Social Issues and Individual Rights. The frequencies were compared and the six categories consolidated into two, issues of School Governance and other issues. Frequencies were compared for these consolidated categories and they were cross-tabulated with selected political science and psychological process categories.

Psychological Process, Protagonist: Frequencies for I, He, We and They were derived separately. Occurrences of I and We were added together to form the Personal category; He and They were added to form the Impersonal; I and He to form

the Individual and We and They to form the Group category. These were compared and a chi-square analysis made. They were compared for individual schools in the Cross-Sectional study and for students as a group in the Urban study.

They were then cross-tabulated with selected civic participation, content, resolution and affect categories.

Antagonist: The responses were coded in terms of antagonists as individuals; members of the same groups, pairs of groups and institutions. In the analysis, individual adversaries versus plural adversaries and institutional adversaries versus non-individual adversaries were compared and chi-squares calculated. Again they were compared for individual schools in the Cross-Sectional Study and for students as a group in the Urban-Suburban study.

They were cross-tabulated with selected civic participation, content, protagonist resolution and affect categories.

Alternatives: The analysis of alternatives compared only none versus one or more alternatives mentioned. Cases in which no alternatives were mentioned were combined with cases in which the response clearly stated that there were no alternatives. These were compared for individual schools in the Cross-Sectional study and for students as a group in the Urban-Suburban study.

Convictions: For those responses in which alternatives were mentioned, frequency of mention of convictions was compared with frequency of choices between expedient acts. Cases in which there was a choice between a conviction and an expedient act were combined with cases in which the choice was between competing convictions. They were compared for individual schools in the Cross-Sectional study and for students as a group in the Urban-Suburban study.

Conflict Resolution, Non-violent: Responses had been coded in terms of participation by all parties to the conflict; participation by some of the parties and participation by only one party. The analysis grouped participation by some or all parties and compared this with unilateral decision-making. While coding was carried out for several non-violent modes of conflict resolution, the analysis was carried out on only negotiation versus decision by authority since these were the only categories mentioned often enough to permit analysis. Again, these were compared for individual schools in the Cross-Sectional study and for students as a group in the Urban-Suburban study.

Force: Coding was carried out for force from peers, subordinates and authorities and the data were analyzed in the same categories. A total use of force category was formed by adding together the totals of the separate frequencies of use of force. The total use of force category was conceptualized as the number of instances of use of force rather than the number of incidents in which force was used. If several parties to a single incident used force, the single incident was represented several times in the use of force category. These were compared for individual schools in the Cross-Sectional study and for students as a group in the Urban-Suburban study.

Affect, Outcome: The writer's judgment of the outcome of his incident was coded into one of four categories: bad, good, mixed or unclear. The frequencies were analyzed as two dichotomies: (1) bad versus good, mixed or unclear

and (2) good versus bad, mixed or unclear. The results were therefore seen from both the point of view of the positive harm and the positive good students saw as derived from the incidents. They were compared for individual schools in the Cross-Sectional study and for all urban students versus all suburban students in the Urban-Suburban study.

Tension Level: Tension level after the incident was analyzed in terms of lowered tension versus raised, unchanged or unclear. It was considered that the successful resolution of a conflict would lower tension level, while unsuccessful resolution might result in either raised or unchanged level of tension. Again, these were compared for individual schools in the Cross-Sectional study and for students as a group in the Urban-Suburban study.

Bibliography

1. DeCecco, John P. Civic Participation in a Crisis Age. Volume II of Civic Education for the Seventies: The Alternative to Reaction and Revolution. New York: Center for Research and Education in American Liberties, 1969.

2. Havighurst, R. J. and Hilda Taba. Adolescent Character and Personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1949.

3. Inhelder, Barbel and Jean Piaget. The Growth of Logical Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Chapter III

OVERALL RESULTS

Arlene Richards

Out of the 6,783 students interviewed, 317 (4.67%) refused to answer or returned blank interview forms. Interviewers had been instructed to inform students that they had the right to refuse to participate. Students were urged but not required to participate. Interviewers collected and obtained all questionnaires. Since all questionnaires were collected at the end of the same class period in which they were distributed, there were none that were not returned. Therefore refusals took the form of blank forms, questionnaires with single line obscenities and the like. In addition to the questionnaires eliminated from further analysis as refusals, 953 (14.04%) of the students approached wrote complaints, tirades, general narratives and the like. These were classified as non-incidents.* In those cases for which it was possible to code the non-incidents, questionnaires were coded for as many categories as it was possible to apply. Thus, non-incidents were often codable on some but not all of the categories: the Participation, Content, Psychological Process, Conflict Resolution, and/or Affect Codes. The total number of cases, therefore, varied from item to item as well as from code to code.

Civic Participation Categories

Table 1: Political Participation Categories of Incidents as Ranked 1 or 2 by Students and Coders

	Coders		Students	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Dissent	49.29	6,463	48.91	5,278
Equality	43.10	6,459	45.37	5,216
Decision-making	68.47	6,460	69.55	5,417
Due Process	39.33	6,454	47.09	5,251
Total	200.19	25,836	210.92	21,162

*It had been suggested that our results were due to a questionnaire form which encouraged complaints. Therefore, a questionnaire was devised which asked specifically for incidents of success; incidents in which the problem had been resolved in a way that was satisfying to the student. We used these forms with half of the 88 students at one high school we visited. At that school 84.09% or 74 students reported bad outcomes, 15.91% or 5 students good outcomes and 3.40% of the students reported lowered tension levels. Therefore, we concluded that our results were not due to the format of the questionnaire.

Dissent: It is clear from a comparison of the frequencies of students' and coders' choices of each category that students did not always rank the categories. For example, only 5,278 students ranked Dissent as a category for their incidents, while 6,463 incidents had Dissent ranked by the coders. Coders, therefore, ranked this category for more incidents than did students.

To compare categories for occurrence of choice as first or second best for incidents, percentages rather than frequencies seemed appropriate because of the difference in total number of incidents for which each category was ranked by students and coders. From Table 2, it can be seen that similar percentages of students and coders chose Dissent as the first or second best category for their incidents--48.91% for students and 49.29% for coders.

Equality: Incidents of Equality were ranked by 5,216 students and by 6,459 coders. This category was chosen first or second best by 45.37% of students and 43.10% of coders.

Decision-making: Incidents concerning Decision-making were ranked by 5,417 students; by 6,460 of coders. It was chosen first or second best category for 69.55% of the students and for 68.47% of the coders.

Due Process: This category of incidents received ranking by 5,251 students and 6,454 by coders. The difference in some cases was accounted for by the reluctance of students to rank for a category when they did not consider the category the first or second best for their incident and in other cases by their reluctance to rank the categories at all. Due Process was chosen as first or second best by 47.09% of the students and by 39.33% of the coders.

Clearly, of these four categories, Decision-making was the one most often selected by both students and coders.

The one category on which students and coders differed significantly in percentage was Due Process. Due Process was chosen as first or second best by approximately equal numbers of students and coders. Coders ranked this category as first or second best for 2,539 incidents while students did so for 2,473 incidents. The difference in percentage appeared to derive from the smaller number of incidents for which students ranked Due Process as the third or fourth category--2,778 for students as compared to 3,915 for coders. Thus, many students omitted giving Due Process any rank when they did not rank the category first or second. The reluctance of students to give Due Process third or fourth preference may stem from a feeling that Due Process was irrelevant to the incidents they described. Since they did not similarly refuse to rank the other categories third or fourth, it seems possible that they did not choose Due Process for third or fourth rank because this was the category on which their understanding of Due Process was least like that of the coders. If this were the case, a follow-up interview might be desirable in which those students who do not rank Due Process are asked to describe what it means to them that seems worthwhile. It may be that civics education should focus on this aspect of democratic participation.

Content Categories

Table 2: Content of Incidents Described by Students

Content Category	Percent Students	Number of Students
Courses and Curriculum	12.79	843
Political Issues	6.47	440
Illegal Acts	10.23	696
Non-academic School Issues	26.97	1,831
Out of School Social Issues	10.24	697
Individual Rights	24.88	1,690
TOTAL*	91.58	6,197

*Total possible 100%. Non-incidents and unclassified incidents plus refusals account for remaining 8.42%.

Taken together, non-academic school issues and individual rights accounted for over half the problems in democracy reported by students. As can be seen in Table 2, non-academic school issues alone were 26.97% of the overall sample; individual rights issues were 24.88%. The combined category of school governance thus covered (51.85%) was more than half of all the issues raised by the students. This indicates that many of the issues provoking conflict in the school were within the power of school administrators to change and are also within the general area of civic participation. Permitting more student participation in making and administering decisions concerning the governance of the schools would seem to be both feasible and useful for many schools. It could have the desirable side-effect of freeing the school administrator from the often onerous responsibilities of representing the adult world to the students and student interests to the community. It could free the administrator to take an explicitly mediating role. He would then not have to defend the parents' or the students' point of view, since these groups or other interested parties in the community could present their own views in decision-making bodies or enforcement units.

Psychological Process Categories

Interpersonal Involvement

Writer and Protagonist

Table 3: Distance and Group Size

		Percent	Number
Distance:	I and We	61.32	4,160
	He and They	30.98	2,102
Group Size:	I and He	45.68	3,099
	We and They	46.62	3,163
		92.30	6,262

Distance: As can be seen in Table 3, in the overall sample only 30.98% of the incidents were described as having a distant protagonist, He or They. Most students were concerned with personal, rather than distant problems.

Group Size: In the overall sample about the same percentage of students wrote incidents in terms of I or He as in terms of We or They. Students described issues as involving individual protagonists equally as often as group protagonists and, clearly, political issues were still seen as personal and individual by high school students. They may need to be helped to appreciate the group nature of political life by an exposure to working in groups to achieve political aims.

Writer and Antagonist

Table 4: Relative Status and Personification

		Percent	Number
Distance:	Peer	19.47	1,319
	Authority	67.65	4,589
		87.12	5,908
Group Size:	Person	45.65	3,907
	Institution	23.45	1,591
		69.10	4,688

Relative Status: In the overall sample most incidents described conflict with authority (67.65%) rather than peers (19.47%). Thus, students' concept of the democratic process involve inequities in status.

Personification: In the overall sample more incidents were reported as conflict with persons (45.65%) than as conflict with institutions (23.45%). Thus, adolescents may be moving toward an impersonal, abstract view of social conflict, but they have not attained it by the high school years.

Alternatives and Convictions

Table 5: Alternative, Conviction and Expediency

		Percent	Number
Overall sample:			
One or more alternatives*		18.22	1,236
No alternative		81.77	5,547
	Total	99.99	6,783
Convictions		79.87	1,024
Expediency only		20.12	258
	Total	99.99	1,282
At Freeport:			
One or more alternatives		2.77	2
No alternatives		97.22	70
	Total	99.99	72

*A suggestion made by Professor Mark Chessler that the paucity of alternatives in our data may have been due to inadequate probing was tested by giving 72 students at Freeport High School a version of the questionnaire with a separate page on which to write an alternative and clear instructions to do that. The results are displayed above. They clearly show that the students were not misunderstanding the intent of the question, but were unable to describe an alternative because there either were none or the students could not articulate them.

Alternatives: In the overall sample (Table 5) only 18.22% of the incidents included descriptions of alternatives to the protagonist's actions in events as they actually occurred. Most students felt, or at least wrote as if they felt, relatively powerless, constrained and limited by the events they experienced. More than four-fifths of the students were either unable or unwilling to articulate their choices. Insofar as this reflects a real lack of choice, it indicates that choices must be made available if students are to have experience in making social and political decisions. Where alternatives are available but the students are either unable to perceive or unable to articulate them, this may indicate a need for getting students to articulate their alternatives so that their decisions are both rational and communicable.

Convictions: Since convictions could only be mentioned as affecting choices in those incidents in which a choice was articulated, few (1,024) incidents were analyzed for the presence or absence of conviction in the alternatives considered. Still, almost four-fifths (79.87%) of those incidents in which a choice was discussed did mention convictions as a factor in that choice. This finding indicates that awareness of alternatives goes along with a relatively high level of moral development and supports the theory that the encouragement of students to articulate their choices would result in their making decisions based on moral or value governed behavior.

Conflict Resolution I

Negotiation versus Decision by Authority

Table 6: Conflict Resolution I: Negotiation and Decision by Authority

	Percent	Number
Negotiation	16.60	1,126
Decision by Authority	55.32	3,753
Total	71.92	4,879

Negotiation: As a means of conflict resolution, negotiation was mentioned in only 16.60% of the incidents in the overall sample. By contrast, resolution by authority decision was mentioned in 55.32% of the incidents. Most of the students in our sample defined "problem in democracy" in terms of conflicts decided by unilateral decisions of authorities. One might speculate from this that many students would perceive their experience in high school as more democratic if more decisions were made with negotiation.

Decision-making: As can be seen in the overall results in Table 6, few modes of conflict resolution by negotiation occurred often enough in the incidents described to warrant detailed analysis.

Conflict Resolution II

Use of Force

Table 7: Conflict Resolution II: Use of Force

	Percent	Number
By Peers	5.54	376
By Subordinates*	2,83	192
By Authorities	10.55	716
Total Violence	18.92	1,284

*Includes any use of force by students against teachers, principals, etc.

In the overall sample (Table 7), 18.92% of the incidents involved use of force. This may be seen as a small percentage since less than one-fifth of the incidents led to use of force. On the other hand, one may not wish to condone use of force in the resolution of almost one-fifth of the conflicts experienced by high school students. One may take the use of force among peers, which was only 5.54%, as a standard. Authorities, by contrast, used force in 10% of the resolutions. If students can abstain from the use of force in almost 95% of their conflicts, the school authorities might be expected to do at least as well! Use of force from subordinates against authorities was mentioned in 2.83% of the incidents in the overall sample. Evidently, students either refrained from use

of force against authorities more often than they refrained from use of force against their peers or avoided mentioning or even being aware of such actions. In any event, students may be presumed to have been aware that use of force against authorities was inappropriate. By contrast, use of force by authorities was mentioned in 10.55% of the incidents. Students perceived (whether or not it actually was so, or would be so reported by authorities) that authorities used force almost five times as often against them as they used it against authorities. This suggests that students see adults using relatively more force and less negotiation than they themselves use. Only by changing this perception can school authorities make students aware that negotiation and not violence is the democratic means of resolving conflicts approved by the adults in our society.

Affect Categories

Table 8: Outcome and Tension Level

		Percent	Number
Outcome:	Bad	61.46	4,169
	Good	9.25	628
Tension Level:	Lowered	9.14	520
	Not lowered	90.86	6,163

Outcome: As shown in Table 8, the outcome of 61.46% of the incidents in the overall sample was evaluated as bad; of a mere 9.25% as good. Overwhelmingly, problems in democracy are seen as having outcomes that are unsatisfying. If people tend to avoid situations found unpleasant in the past, it might be expected that they would be "turned off" by their political experiences in the schools more than educators would want them to be.

Tension Level: The tension level was reported as lowered in so small a percentage of incidents (9.14%) that few conflicts reported can be presumed to have decreased the potential for violence in future conflicts. Indeed, the outlook for de-escalation of affect and the use of reason in future conflicts is bleak. Clearly, the modes of conflict resolution used in these schools in 1969 were not conducive to learning how to resolve conflicts in a way that would be satisfying to the participants.

Data Analysis Reliability

Inter-rater reliabilities for all categories are shown in Table 9. All the categories shown were judged to be reliable enough to warrant further interpretation of the data. The results tables shown in the different comparisons include indications of significance levels.*

---

*Significance levels express the likelihood that a given finding would be repeated 95 out of 100 times using different random samples of students from the same schools as ours.

Table 9: Inter-Rater Reliability

Variable	Agree	Percent	R	Total
Incident - Non-incident	156	80.82	.656	193
Content I[1]	149	77.20	.593	193
Content I[2]	168	87.04	.757	193
Content I[3]	176	91.19	.828	193
Interpersonal Involvement[4]	141	72.54	.533	193
Interpersonal Involvement[5]	146	76.65	.578	193
Person vs. Institution[6]	141	72.54	.533	193
Person vs. Institution[7]	146	75.65	.578	193
Peer vs. Authority	148	76.68	.593	193
Alternatives	148	76.68	.593	193
Conviction vs. Expediency	140	72.53	.533	193
Resolution Process I[8]	140	72.53	.533	193
Negotiation	145	75.12	.562	193
Violence from Peers	176	91.19	.828	193
Violence from Subordinates	181	93.78	.884	193
Violence from Authorities	167	86.52	.757	193
Decision by Authority	136	70.46	.490	193
Formal Vote - Elections	187	96.89	.941	193
Mediation	189	97.92	.960	193
Arbitration	178	92.22	.846	193
Verbal Threats	165	85.49	.722	193
Petitions	170	88.08	.774	193
Affect Outcome[9]	136	70.46	.490	193
Affect Outcome[10]	153	79.27	.624	193
Tension Level[11]	147	76.16	.578	193

Except as noted below, Reliability was figured on a one-to-one basis.

[1]Content I: 1-2-3-5 vs. 4-4

[2]Content I: 2 vs. all (Political Issues vs. other)

[3]Content I: 5 vs. all (Out-of-school Social Issues vs. other)

[4]Interpersonal Involvement: 1-2 vs. 3-4 (I-We vs. He-They)

[5]Interpersonal Involvement: 1-3 vs. 2-4 (I-He vs. We-They)

[6]Person vs. Institution: 1 vs. all (Individual adversary vs. plural adversary)

[7]Person vs. Institution: 4 vs. all (Institutional adversary vs. non-institutional)

[8]Resolution Process I: 1 vs. all (complete participation vs. partial or none)

[9]Affect Outcome: 1 vs. all (bad vs. good, mixed, and unclear)

[10]Affect Outcome: 2 vs. all (good vs. bad, mixed, and unclear)

[11]Tension Level: 2 vs. all (Lowered vs. raised, unchanged, unclear).

The data are shown as percentages. Therefore, χ^2 statistic which gives significance levels for percentages was used. A good non-technical description of the technique used can be found in DeCecco, John P., The Psychology of Learning and Instruction: Educational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1968, pp. 736-7.

Conclusions:

In evaluating our results, it must be kept in mind that the schools do not constitute a random sample of all schools inthe country. Data from individual schools have been analyzed separately for those schools selected as representative of particular types. For example, evidence from the tables in the urban-suburban comparison suggest that Mineola Junior High may be representative of suburban junior high schools in communities with mixed socio-economic status. Therefore, a junior high school in a similar community may be especially interested in the data from this school and may find it far more useful to look at this in detail than to use the general sample to try to draw conclusions about its own situation.

The conclusions from our data suggest the following:

1. The majority of high school students see "dilemma in democracy" as referring to a situation in which they cannot cope with an experience of injustice. In other words, they see themselves as relatively powerless.

2. More incidents described by students as dilemmas in democracy involved decision-making than due process, equality or dissent. The latter three categories were used to label approximately equal percentages of incidents, while decision-making was the label chosen for many more incidents than any of the other three alternatives.

3. Many incidents involved allegations of arbitrary behavior on the part of teachers. Relatively few incidents reflected concerns with political units larger than the school. City, state and national problems were infrequently mentioned.

4. Many incidents reported were described in terms of the writer as individual or of an individual he had observed rather than a group. Many involved interpersonal conflict between individuals, many more between an individual and the school as an institution.

5. The vast majority of incidents were described as perceiving no alternative courses of action for the writer or protagonist. There was a great sense of helplessness, of having been forced into actions rather than having chosen to act.

6. Those incidents described as resolved were most often described as resolved by unilateral decision--rarely was a situation described in which there was a resolution achieved with the participation of more than one person.

7. Dissatisfaction and raised tension levels resulting from incidents were almost universal.

Large groups of students in all the schools studied have common affect regardless of economic backgrounds.

Most students are angry, hostile and frustrated. They want to change the system but most experience a sense of powerlessness. As shown by the content codes, students are most often aroused by what they consider unjust and arbitrary teacher conduct. They are outraged that they must suffer the humiliation of not being given a fair chance.

Other students are apathetic and uninvolved. They resent the disruptive students. There is racial antagonism in this group. They are hostile toward and disgusted with "preferential treatment" and "giving in to them."

In sum, some students are angry at authorities for making arbitrary decisions while other students are angry at authorities for "giving in to the troublemakers." One group expressed anger against authority for arbitrary decisions counter to student interests, the other expressed anger against authority actions favoring the first group. One may speculate that both groups might be more satisfied if they felt they had some role in a participatory decision-making process.

The overall picture of high school political life has been shown by these students to be very different from the harmonious democratic mode glowingly portrayed in civics textbooks. For the high school student, the gap between civic theory and civic experience is enormous.

Chapter IV

CROSS-SECTIONAL COMPARISON

Arlene Richards

Civic Participation Categories

Table 10: Cross Sectional Comparison of Participation Categories Ranked 1 or 2 by Students and Coders

Schools	Total Interviewed		Dissent %	Equality %	Decision-making %	Due Process %	χ^2**
Brandeis	353	S*	57.76	53.77	65.57	39.33	
		C	62.34	44.62	65.29	28.16	
							43.87**
Joan of Arc	454	S	46.34	48.73	61.76	53.04	
		C	43.99	51.40	63.36	39.91	
							6.67**
P.S. 165	105	S	49.47	43.62	54.74	54.26	
		C	30.39	49.51	80.58	49.59	
							12.03**
Mineola H.S.	1,311	S	56.43	31.56	83.09	47.51	
		C	59.33	31.05	72.89	36.98	
							18.75**
Mineola J.H.S.	616	S	41.63	43.56	61.52	62.06	
		C	37.21	45.18	58.04	59.63	
							1.32**
Hastings H.S.	333	S	46.80	44.10	81.40	33.80	
		C	56.00	34.15	76.10	32.61	
							6.92**
Hastings J.H.S.	471	S	52.50	38.80	67.90	40.30	
		C	47.80	37.40	75.20	38.90	
							3.27**
Hunter H.S.	166	S	54.61	55.79	76.87	29.01	
		C	60.87	49.04	60.81	25.32	
							5.174**
Hunter J.H.S.	95	S	63.41	51.85	74.75	22.00	
		C	70.00	44.44	66.67	25.00	
							1.810**

* S = Student ranking C = Coder ranking

** χ^2 between student and coder rankings

*** $\chi^2 \geq 7.815$ required for significance.

At suburban Mineola High School, Table 10 shows a significant (χ^2 = 18.75) difference between students' and coders' ranking of categories. No significant difference (χ^2 = 1.32) between students' and coders' rankings of the

participation categories was found at Mineola Junior High School. The differences likely to have produced the significance at Mineola High occurred in the Decision-making and Due Process categories. The Due Process category, however, appeared to differ mainly in the number of incidents on which students ranked it third or fourth (432) as compared to the number on which coders ranked it third or fourth (792). This difference paralleled one found in the overall sample. In this instance, as in the overall sample, the students' reluctance to rank the category at all when they did not rank it first or second may be noted and ascribed to either lack of understanding of this category of difficulty in using the particular label attached to it. In the discussion of this point above, in connection with the overall sample, the possible alternative explanation that Due Process was not ranked similarly to other categories because students considered it irrelevant was discounted. Over twice as many coders (340) as students (152) ranked Decision-making third or fourth. The difference in the percentage ranking of Decision-making appears to be due to a process similar to that which led to omission rather than lower ranking when these categories were less preferred. A comparison of Decision-making and Due Process issues at Mineola High School shows that these categories were ambiguous when applied to two specific situations frequently cited by Mineola students. Many students at Mineola failed to rank the categories for their incidents, many failed to rank third and fourth best choices. Therefore, results in the civic participation codes at Mineola High and Junior High probably do not represent a true developmental trend.

The other suburban cross-section consisted of Hastings High School and Hastings Junior High. Neither of these schools produced a significant difference between students' and coders' rankings of the categories. Thus, students' understanding of these categories has not been shown to be significantly different from coders at suburban schools.

In city schools,* results were mixed. Neither at Hunter High nor Hunter Junior High was any significant difference shown between students' and coders' rankings of the civic participation categories. It can be concluded, therefore, that there was no difference shown between very intelligent high school or junior

---

*Hunter High School and Hunter Junior High have students who are similar in socio-economic background and intelligence. They come to Hunter from all over New York City and are selected to attend these schools on the basis of competitive achievement tests. All of the students at both schools are girls.

At P.S. 165, Joan of Arc Junior High and Brandeis, the pupils come from the same geographical area. One can conjecture that socio-economic factors are fairly constant. This assumption is not as defensible for these schools as it is for the suburban schools because more New York City students attend parochial, non-secular private, or special public high schools than suburban students. The socio-economic level of students at the non-specialized public high schools is likely to be lower than that of elementary students for this reason. Since the intellectual elite of the public high schools is in the special public high schools, while the suburban schools have a wider range of students, this factor is different in the public city schools than in the suburban schools. The urban-suburban comparisons in the next chapter detail some of the differences.

high school girls' understanding of the civic participation categories and those of our coders.

At Brandeis High School, there was a significant ($\chi^2 = 43.87$) difference between students' and coders' rankings of the civic participation categories. Examination of the frequencies underlying the significantly different percentages, however, revealed a situation similar to that at Mineola High School. Students (137) ranked Due Process as the third or fourth best category for incidents less often than coders (227). Although both coders and students ranked Due Process as first or second best category exactly the same number of times (89), the percentages were different for students (39.33%) than for coders (28.16%). Since Due Process was the only category for which there was a difference of 10% or more between students and coders, the difference appeared to be due to the reluctance of students to rank this category third or fourth best. At Joan of Arc Junior High no difference between students' and coders' ranking of categories was shown ($\chi^2 = 6.67$). At P.S. 165, students ranked the categories significantly ($\chi^2 = 12.03$) different from coders. Looking at the percentages for each category, one can see that Decision-making was chosen as first or second best far more often by coders (80.58%, $f = 83$) than by students (54.74%, $f = 52$). Dissent was chosen more often by students (49.47%, $f = 47$) than by coders (30.39%, $f = 31$). Due Process was chosen first or second best more often by students (54.26%, $f = 51$) than by coders (40.59%, $f = 41$). In sum, the differences between students' and coders' rankings of the civic participation categories was not clearly different at the junior high school than at the high school level, but a difference between students at the elementary school level and coders was suggested by our data.

Given that students beyond elementary level have not been shown to differ from coders in the way they rank civic participation categories it was superfluous to question whether there was a development from junior high to high school in terms of more closely approaching the adult labeling of incidents. The next question to be considered was whether there is a difference in perceived civic participation issues associated with grade level of the students. Since coders ranked more completely, their judgments were used throughout in this analysis.

Dissent: At Mineola, Dissent (59.33%) was significantly ($\chi^2 = 52.61$) more often an issue in the high school than in the junior high (37.21%). The same was true at Hastings ($\chi^2 = 6.21$) with the percentage at the high school (56.00%) and the junior high (47.80%). At Hunter there were more incidents in the junior high school labeled Dissent ($\chi^2 = 2.09$) but the difference was not significant. At Brandeis High School, Joan of Arc Junior High and Public School 165, the percentage of incidents labeled Dissent was higher as the level of school went up ($\chi^2 = 41.06$). In general, Dissent appeared to be a more frequent category as school level increased.

Equality: Equality appeared to account for the same proportion of incidents at each school level for each set of schools. No significant differences were found between school levels in proportion of incidents labeled Equality.

Decision-making: The percentage of incidents labeled Decision-making was significantly ($\chi^2 = 41.17$) higher at Mineola High School than at Mineola Junior High. No significant differences between schools at different levels were found for the other schools, however.

Due Process: The percentage of incidents labeled Due Process was significantly ($\chi^2 = 80.28$) lower at Mineola High School than at Mineola Junior High. No significant differences between schools at different levels were found for the other schools.

Conclusions and Implications: School level appears not to be a significant factor in (1) the agreement between students and coders on the civic participation codes, or (2) between proportions of incidents in each category of civic participation codes. No developmental pattern in either the understanding or relevance to the student's experience has been shown for the civic participation codes from junior high to high school level. The conclusion reached from the overall sample analysis that Decision-making is the category most relevant to the problems encountered in the civic life of the school is supported by the Cross-Sectional analysis for all levels of school. At the same time, the Cross-Sectional analysis revealed a possibility of problems peculiar to an individual school which would best be dealt with in terms of one of the four concepts labeled by our categories. Rather than organize curriculum "units" in which each of the categories is taught with examples, the present study indicates that the categories be used as conceptual tools for the greater understanding of problems actually encountered in the schools.

Content Categories

Political vs. Out-of-School Social Issues: In the suburban schools, the results were clear. As seen in Table 11 at Mineola, Political Issues were more frequently mentioned in the high school (1.66%) than at the junior high (0.96%), Social Issues involving peers were more frequently mentioned in the junior high (19.46%) than at the high school (4.63%). At Hastings, the same relationship held true ($\chi^2 = 25.19$(. In the city schools, Out-of-School Social Issues were more frequently mentioned at P.S. 165 than at Joan of Arc Junior High and more frequently at Joan of Arc than at Brandeis High ($\chi^2 = 68.23$); more frequently at Hunter Junior High than at Hunter High ($\chi^2 = 0.76$). Political Issues were more frequently mentioned at Brandeis than at Joan of Arc ($\chi^2 = 69.48$); and more frequently at Joan of Arc than at P.S. 165.* The one exception to this trend was at Hunter, where Political Issues were more frequently mentioned at the junior high than at the high school level. In general, except for Hunter, which is discussed below, the hypothesis that increasing age (as indicated by higher level of school) brings increased concern with larger social units seems borne out by our Cross-Sectional data.

The sole exception to the pattern of increased concern with Political Issues at higher levels of school was at Hunter. It was found by re-reading those incidents classified as Political, that many were on the same topic, i.e., an issue that had been discussed throughout the school just before our arrival. The Hunter Junior High School students were unusual in their categorization of incidents in the participation codes as well as on the content codes as was noted above. The unusual results at Hunter suggest that intellectual factors influenced our data.

---

*At P.S. 165, there was no mention of Political Issues at all.

Table 11: Cross Sectional Comparison of Content Categories

Schools	Total Interviewed #	Courses and Curriculum %	Political Issues %	Illegal Acts Real or Alleged %	Non-Academic School Issues %	Out of school Social Issues %	Individual Rights %
Brandeis	353	12.41	24.33	8.75	19.77	8.20	16.88
Joan of Arc	454	7.48	4.40	9.24	31.04	9.68	26.19
P.S. 165	105	1.90	0.00	0.95	28.56	29.52	28.55
2 vs. 5 χ^{2*}						68.23	
Mineola H.S.	1,311	20.26	1.66	7.81	37.42	4.63	22.24
Mineola J.H.S.	616	4.19	0.96	11.98	33.39	19.46	23.03
2 vs. 5 χ^{2*}						20.52	
Hastings H.S.	333	6.90	11.11	16.21	20.42	6.30	29.12
Hastings J.H.S.	471	7.43	4.45	13.58	17.62	15.07	32.27
2 vs. 5 χ^{2*}						25.19	
Hunter H.S.	166	30.72	7.22	5.42	24.09	10.24	13.25
Hunter J.H.S.	95	18.94	23.15	1.05	15.78	17.89	13.68
2 vs. 5 χ^{2*}						.76	

* χ^2 category 2 vs. category 5

** $\chi^2 \geq 7.815$ required for significance

*** $\chi^2 \geq 3.841$ required for significance

The content categories have also been interpreted in terms of issues involving School Governance versus issues not directly involved in the governance of the school. Issues involving School Governance were defined as those in the Non-academic School Issues category and those in the Individual Rights category. Courses and Curriculum issues were not included in this category because school people were presumed to have technical competence in this area which students did not have. It was decided, therefore, that only non-curriculum aspects of school functioning would even be considered as fair game for student participation in Decision-making. The School Governance issues were also selected because school administrators could be presumed to have more control over these issues than over Out-of-School Social Issues involving peers, Political Issues or Illegal Acts by Students. School Governance is thus a category of issues over which administrators have some control, but not an exclusive expertise. It was presumed that school people would be particularly interested in such issues.

In the suburban schools in our Cross-Sectional sample, School Governance issues did not increase or decrease with school level. Of the issues, 59.66% cited in incidents by students at Mineola High School and 56.42% of the issues cited in incidents by students at Mineola Junior High involved School Governance. At Hastings High, 49.54% of the issues cited in incidents by students involved School Governance; at Hastings Junior High 49.89% did so.

In the city schools, the results were similar. School Governance issues did not increase or decrease systematically with school level. At Brandeis, they were 36.65%, at Joan of Arc 57.23%, and at P.S. 165 57.11%. At Hunter High, they were 37.34% and at Hunter Junior High, they were 29.46%. Issues of School Governance appeared important at all levels of schools from elementary through high school.

Conclusions: The first major conclusion from our Cross-Sectional analysis of the content codes is that as adolescents get older they become increasingly more concerned with more distant issues. The implication for teaching is that curriculum can deal with increasingly remote issues as students progress in school. A second conclusion comes from the finding that there were many students who expressed interest in political issues at Hunter Junior High. The Hunter Junior High School students were unusual in their categorization of incidents in the participation codes as well as on the content codes as was noted above. The unusual results at Hunter suggest that intellectual factors influenced our data. A third conclusion is that possibly the most important one for school administrators concerns School Governance since this accounted for a sizeable proportion of the issues reported in every school. One may conclude that there are many negotiable incidents involving non-technical school matters at every level of school.

Psychological Process Categories

Interpersonal Involvement

Writer and Protagonist

Distance: In the suburban schools, this contrast yielded equivocal results. As seen in Table 12, the students at Mineola High described incidents in terms of I or We (62.46%) less frequently than students at Mineola Junior High (66.06%), and more frequently in terms of He or They (32.63%) than students at

Table 12: Cross Sectional Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement

Schools	Total Interviewed	Distance		χ^2	Group Size		χ^2
		I and We %	He and They %		I and He %	We and They %	
Mineola H.S.	1,311	62.46	32.63		34.77	60.32	
Mineola J.H.S.	616	66.06	30.02		57.13	38.95	
				1.71*			<u>80.00*</u>
Hastings H.S.	333	56.14	34.22		25.82	64.56	
Hastings J.H.S.	471	71.54	26.32		54.14	43.73	
				<u>8.76*</u>			<u>52.00*</u>
Brandeis	353	52.68	37.95		40.78	49.85	
Joan of Arc	454	59.46	26.42		53.73	32.15	
P.S. 165	105	80.94	12.37		63.80	29.51	
				<u>26.79**</u>			<u>22.51**</u>
Hunter H.S.	166	48.78	45.17		29.51	64.44	
Hunter J.H.S.	95	72.62	23.15		55.78	39.99	
				<u>13.78*</u>			<u>17.08*</u>

* value $\geq$ 3.841 required for significance

** value $\geq$ 7.815 required for significance

All significant values are underlined

Mineola Junior High (30.02%), but this difference, although in the predicted direction, did not reach significance. At Hastings High School, students less frequently described incidents in terms of I or We (56.14%) than at Hastings Junior High (71.54%) and more frequently in terms of He or They (34.22%) than at Hastings Junior High (26.32%). The difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 8.76$).

In the city schools, students at Brandeis described incidents less frequently in terms of I or We (52.68%) than students at Joan of Arc Junior High (59.46%); students at Joan of Arc in turn, used I or We less frequently than students at P.S. 165 (80.94%). Students at Brandeis also used He and They more frequently than students at Joan of Arc (26.42%): students at Joan of Arc, in turn, used He or They more frequently than those at P.S. 165 (12.37%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 26.79$). Students at Hunter High School used I or We less frequently (48.78%) than students at Hunter Junior High School (72.62%). Students at Hunter High also used He or They more frequently (45.17%) than students at Hunter Junior High (23.15%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 13.78$). In sum, all comparisons were in the predicted direction and all but one were significant. The higher the school level, the more likely students were to describe incidents involving others rather than themselves.

Group Size: In the suburban schools, this comparison yielded unequivocal results. Students at Mineola High School described incidents involving a single person, I or He less often (34.77%) than students at Mineola Junior High (57.13%). Students at Mineola High also described incidents in terms of a group more often than (60.32%) students at Mineola Junior High (38.95%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 80.00$). Students at Hastings High School described incidents in terms of I or He less often (25.82%) than students at Hastings Junior High (54.14%). Students at Hastings High also described incidents in terms of We or They more often (64.56%) than students at Hastings Junior High (43.73%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 8.76$).

In the city schools, this comparison also yielded unequivocal results. At Brandeis High, students described incidents in terms of I or He less often (40.78%) than students at Joan of Arc Junior High (53.73%); students at Joan or Arc, in turn, used I or He less often than students at P.S. 165 (63.80%). Students at Brandeis described incidents in terms of We or They more often than students at P.S. 165 (29.51%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 22.51$). Students at Hunter High School described incidents in terms of I or He less often than students at Hunter Junior High School (55.78%). Students at Hunter High also described incidents in terms of We or They more often (64.44%) than students at Hunter Junior High (39.99%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 17.08$). In sum, all differences were significant and in the predicted direction. One can conclude that the size of the group with which students were concerned increased with higher school level.

Conclusions and Implications: Students at higher levels of school were more likely to describe incidents involving others and more likely to describe incidents involving large groups. The Piaget's hypothesis mentioned above in the section on content issues is further supported by this finding.

At higher levels of school, therefore, students can be expected to become more interested in the concerns of others. At lower levels, the findings on distance and group size suggest that the curriculum will be more in keeping with

the interests of students if it focusses on the immediately present and on the individual. One should not overlook, however, the fact that a sizeable proportion of the concerns of even the high school student are personal and individual. Curriculum planning may well take this into account by allotting some time to issues arising within the classroom and to individual concerns as part of the civic education of students.

Writer and Antagonist

Table 13: Cross-Sectional Comparison of Relative Status and Personification

Schools	Total Interviewed	Peer %	Authority %	Personification Person %	Personification Institution %
Mineola H.S.	1,311	9.53	81.69	48.74	28.45
Mineola J.H.S.	616	32.62	58.27	59.37	12.82
χ^2		159.17**	120.01**	13.90**	57.09**
Hastings	333	18.91	76.97	31.83	33.03
Hastings J.H.S.	471	26.53	60.93	44.16	20.80
χ^2		26.00**	7.45**	12.46**	15.23**
Brandeis	353	18.13	66.28	29.74	28.99
Joan of Arc	454	21.14	57.48	60.13	10.79
P.S. 165	105	49.52	41.90	78.09	3.80
χ^2		47.25*	20.88*	109.66*	61.04*
Hunter H.S.	166	31.92	56.02	23.49	31.92
Hunter J.H.S.	95	35.78	50.52	22.10	14.73
χ^2		.40**	.73**	.07**	9.37**

* χ^2 value $\geq$ 7.815 required for significance

** χ^2 value $\geq$ 3.841 required for significance

Relative Status: In the suburban schools the results on conflict with peers were clear. As can be seen in Table 13 at Mineola High School fewer (9.53%) peer conflicts were reported than at Mineola Junior High (32.62%). Hastings High School had significantly (χ^2 = 26.00) fewer (18.91%) peer conflicts reported than Hastings Junior High (26.53%). Both suburban comparisons indicated that peer conflict was more often described in suburban junior high schools than in suburban high schools.

In the suburban schools the results on conflict with authorities were equally clear. The frequency of conflict with authorities was significantly (χ^2 = 120.01) greater at Mineola High (81.69%) than at Mineola Junior High (58.27%). Similarly, at Hastings High there was significantly (χ^2 = 7.45) more

conflict reported with authorities (76.97%) than at Hastings Junior High (60.93%). Both suburban comparisons showed that conflict with authority was more often described at high school than at junior high school level. In suburban schools, fewer conflicts were seen involving peers and more involving authorities as school level increased from junior high to high school.

In urban schools, the results were similar but less conclusive, again because of the exceptional results from Hunter Junior High and Hunter High School. At Brandeis fewer incidents were reported as (18.13%) conflicts with peers than at Joan of Arc (21.14%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, fewer incidents were reported as conflicts with peers than at P.S. 165 (49.52%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 47.25$). At Hunter High there was less peer conflict with peers reported (31.92%) than at Hunter Junior High (35.78%). The difference was not significant ($\chi^2 = 0.40$), but was in the predicted direction. At Brandeis, there was more conflict reported with authority (66.28%) than at Joan of Arc (57.48%), at Joan of Arc, in turn, there was more reported than at P.S. 165 (41.90%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 20.88$). At Hunter High there was more conflict reported with authority (56.02%) than at Hunter Junior High (50.52%). The differences were not significant ($\chi^2 = 0.73$) although in the predicted direction. In sum, at the urban schools, fewer conflicts were seen as involving peers and more as involving authorities as school level increases. The findings for urban schools are similar to those for suburban schools in this respect.

Personification: In the suburban schools, results were clear. Significantly ($\chi^2 = 13.90$) fewer conflicts were seen as with persons at Mineola High School (48.74%) than at Mineola Junior High (59.57%). Significantly ($\chi^2 = 12.46$) fewer conflicts were seen as with persons at Hastings High School (31.83%) than at Hastings Junior High (44.16%). In sum, conflict with persons was more frequent at suburban junior high schools than at suburban high schools.

In the urban schools, results were also clear and paralleled those in the suburban schools. At Brandeis there were fewer incidents reported as conflicts with persons (29.74%) than at Joan of Arc (60.13%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, fewer incidents were reported as conflicts with persons than at P.S. 165 (78.09%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 109.66$). There was no significant difference between Hunter High School and Hunter Junior High in percentage of conflicts reported with persons. In sum, all significant differences showed more conflicts reported with persons in urban junior highs than in urban high schools.

The results on conflict reported with an institution, as opposed to a person or a group, were unequivocal in the suburban schools. At Mineola High School, significantly ($\chi^2 = 57.09$) more incidents were reported as conflicts with the institution (28.45%) than at Mineola Junior High (12.82%). Similarly, at Hastings High School significantly ($\chi^2 = 15.23$) more incidents were reported as conflicts with the institution (33.03%) than at Hastings Junior High (20.80%). Thus, conflict with institutions was more frequently reported at suburban junior highs than at suburban high schools.

In the urban schools results were clear and again paralleled those found in the suburban schools. At Brandeis more incidents were reported as involving conflict with the institution (28.98%) than at Joan of Arc (10.79%) than at P.S. 165 (3.80%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 61.04$). At Hunter High

School significantly (^{2} = 9.37) more incidents were reported as conflicts with authority (31.92%) than at Hunter Junior High (14.73%). In sum, more conflicts were reported as conflicts with the institution in high schools than in junior high schools, both urban and suburban.

Conclusions: The relative status and personification comparisons led to the conclusion that the antagonists in conflicts were more often perceived as authorities and as institutions with increasing school level. Distance, as indicated by relative status of the antagonist, increased with school level as did distance as indicated by self-involvement of the protagonist. Group size, as indicated by personification of the antagonist, increased with school level, as did group size as indicated by size of the group described as protagonist. In general, both distance and group size increase with school level. Piaget's conception of the adolescent as increasingly concerned with larger and more distant groups seems confirmed by our data.

Alternatives and Convictions

Table 14: Cross-Sectional Comparison of Alternatives and Convictions

Schools	Total Interviewed	One or More Alternatives %	Conviction %
Mineola H.S.	1,311	16.55	64.65
Mineola J.H.S.	616	25.16	77.24
χ^2		19.95	
Hastings H.S.	333	20.42	81.57
Hastings J.H.S.	471	23.99	73.27
χ^2		1.43	
Brandeis	353	15.01	84.90
Joan of Arc	454	10.79	63.46
P.S. 165	105	10.47	58.33
χ^2		3.69	
Hunter H.S.	166	37.35	93.65
Hunter J.H.S.	95	40.00	89.47
χ^2		4.61	
Overall sample	6,783	18.22	79.87

$\chi^2 \geq 3.841$ required for significance

Alternatives: The suburban comparisons showed no clear results. As can be seen in Table 14, Mineola High School significantly (^{2} = 19.94) fewer students indicated one or more alternatives to their actions (16 55%) than at Mineola Junior High (25.16%). At Hastings High School about the same percentage of students indicated one or more alternatives to their actions (20.42%) as at Hastings Junior High School (23.99%). Thus, at the suburban schools, fewer students seemed to see alternatives the higher the level of the school, but this result was not statistically significant for both comparisons.

In the urban schools, the results were similarly inconclusive. More students at Brandeis High School indicated alternatives (15.01%) than at Joan of Arc Junior High (10.79%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, approximately the same number of students indicated alternatives as at P.S. 165 (10.47%). At Hunter High School about the same proportion of students indicated alternatives (37.35%) as at Hunter Junior High (40.00%). There was no clear pattern of reported alternatives associated with school level in the urban schools.

Convictions: The results on presence of conviction in the choice of alternative were obtained only on those incidents for which an alternative was mentioned since few incidents included an alternative, as included in this analysis. As a consequence, the following results are highly tentative. In the suburban schools, the results were unclear. At Mineola High School significantly ($\chi^2 = 37.43$) fewer decisions involving a conviction (64.65%) were described than at Mineola Junior High (77.24%). At Hastings High School significantly more decisions involving conviction (81.57%) were described than at Hastings Junior High (73.27%). The differences appear to be idiosyncratic rather than systematically related to level of school.

In the urban schools, results were also unclear. At Brandeis High School, there were more reported incidents involving conviction (84.90%) than at Joan of Arc Junior High (63.46%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, there were more than at P.S. 165 (58.33%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 7.44$). At Hunter High School, there were about as many incidents involving conviction (93.65%) as at Hunter Junior (89.47%).

Conclusions: Aside from the pattern of development, the striking finding in this table was the relatively high occurrence of conviction and the relatively low occurrence of alternatives at every level. This finding suggests that moral learning is not as deficient as perception of alternatives; that more attention to choices may pay off better than more emphasis on inculcation of moral values in the schools at every level.

A second striking finding was the lack of developmental difference. Assuming that the ability to see alternatives is a more mature state than the inflexible inability to see alternatives for one's actions, one would have expected more mention of alternatives in the high schools. Since this did not happen, there were no more alternatives for action for high school students than for junior high school students, or the older students were less likely to mention the alternatives they perceived. The desirable increased perception of alternatives at the high school level might best be fostered by:

1. providing more opportunities for choice;

2. providing more decision-making experience, both vicariously in that students have the opportunity to hear the decision-making processes of others and directly in terms of helping the student to articulate his own choices;

3. increasing the student's awareness of his own choice-making so that more of his choices are conscious and articulate.

Conflict Resolution I

Negotiation versus Decision by Authority

Table 15: Cross-Sectional Comparison of the Incidence of Negotiation and Decision by Authority

Schools	Total Interviewed	Negotiation %	χ^2	Decision by Authority %	χ^2
Mineola H.S.	1,311	15.02		73.14	
Mineola J.H.S.	616	23.05	18.61*	56.65	2.31*
Hastings H.S.	333	20.72		48.94	
Hastings J.H.S.	471	20.59		53.92	1.95*
Brandeis	353	9.63		46.74	
Joan of Arc	454	11.23		53.74	
P.S. 165	105	12.38	0.87**	47.61	0.07**
Hunter H.S.	166	19.87		39.15	
Hunter J.H.S.	95	24.21	0.67	27.89	

* $\chi^2 \geq 7.815$ required for significance.

** $\chi^2 \geq 3.841$ required for significance.

Negotiation: According to Table 15, the number of reported attempts at negotiation did not vary systematically with school level in the suburban school. At Mineola High School, negotiation was reported as attempted significantly ($\chi^2 = 18.61$) less often (15.02%) than at Mineola Junior High (23.05%). At Hastings High School, negotiation was reported as attempted (20.72%) about as often as at Hastings Junior High (20.59%). There was, if anything, less negotiation at the high school level than at the junior high school level.

In the urban schools, there were clearer results. At Brandeis High School, there were fewer attempts at negotiation reported (9.63%) than Joan of Arc Junior High (11.23%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, fewer attempts at negotiation were reported than at P.S. 165 (12.38%). The differences, however, were not significant ($\chi^2 = .87$). At Hunter High School significantly ($\chi^2 = .67$) fewer attempts at negotiation reported (19.87%) than at Hunter Junior High (24.21%). The attempts at negotiation were not shown to vary systematically in urban schools with school level.

Decision by Authority: Unilateral decisions by school authorities, teachers and/or administrators, were included in this category. In the suburban schools there were mixed results. At Mineola High School, significantly ($\chi^2 = 52.31$) more decisions by authorities (73.14%) were reported than at Mineola Junior High (56.65%). At Hastings High School, there were not significantly ($\chi^2 = 1.93$) fewer decisions by authorities reported (48.94%) than at Hastings Junior High (53.92%). Reports of decision by authority did not vary systematically with school level in the suburban schools.

In the urban schools, results were also mixed. At Brandeis High School fewer decisions by authority were reported (46.74%) than at Joan of Arc Junior High (53.74%); but at Joan of Arc more decisions by authorities were reported than at P.S. 165 (47.61%). The differences were not significant ($\chi^2 = .07$). At Hunter High School about as many (39.15%) decisions by authorities were reported as at Hunter Junior High (37.89%). Thus, in the urban high schools, reported decisions by authorities did not vary systematically with school level. At neither suburban nor urban high schools was there a clear pattern of decision by authority varying with school level.

In all of the schools in the cross-sectional samples, it appeared that conflict resolution was more often attempted by unilateral decision by authorities than by negotiation.

Conclusions: While neither attempts at conflict resolution by negotiation nor attempts at conflict resolution by authority decision varied systematically with school level in either the urban or suburban schools, there were some significant differences between schools. School administrators may have the option of increasing students' perception of attempts at negotiation by increasing the number of actual negotiations attempted regardless of school level. Assuming greater maturity and readiness for negotiation in high school students, administrators may be expected to initiate negotiations even more often in high schools than at lower levels. This could be expected to result in more reports of negotiation in the schools where it is tried. As long as decision by authority continues to be the most frequent perceived mode of conflict resolution in the schools, it cannot be claimed that students are being educated for democratic participation.

Conflict Resolution II

Use of Force

As can be seen in Table 16, in the incidents described, use of force was reported from as few as 6.62% to as many as 34.26% of peers, subordinates or authorities. Patterns of reported use of force were erratic in terms of school level. They could have been more closely linked to social values in the school community than to the level of school.

There were fewer reports of use of force in suburban high schools than in suburban junior high schools. At Mineola High School there were significantly ($\chi^2 = 23.13$) fewer (13.40%), than at Mineola Junior High (20.28%). At Hastings High School, there were also significantly ($\chi^2 = 9.10$) fewer (9.61%) than at Hastings Junior High (11.85%).

In the urban schools, the pattern appeared, if anything, to be the reverse of that in the suburban schools. At Brandeis, there were more (34.26%) than at Joan of Arc Junior High (31.04%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, there were more than at P.S. 165 (19.99%). The differences were not significant ($\chi^2 = 0.31$). At Hunter High School, there were fewer but not significantly ($\chi^2 = 0.69$) fewer (6.62%) than at Hunter Junior High (9.46%). In the urban schools, then, the differences in reported use of force differed little for the ordinary schools as represented by the Brandeis, Joan of Arc, P.S. 165 sample, than for the special "middle class" schools as represented by Hunter High and Hunter Junior High.

Table 16: Cross-Sectional Comparison of the Incidence of Use of Force

Schools	Total Interviewed	Peers %	Subordinates %	Authorities %	Total Force %
Mineola H.S.	1,311	1.67	1.06	10.67	13.40
Mineola J.H.S.	616	11.20	1.62	7.46	20.28
χ^2		81.69**	1.12**	6.38**	23.13**
Hastings H.S.	333	3.31	2.10	4.20	9.61
Hastings J.H.S.	471	4.45	0.82	6.58	11.85
χ^2		.71**	98.42**	2.14**	9.10**
Brandeis	353	9.34	9.91	15.01	34.26
Joan of Arc	454	11.67	3.74	15.63	31.04
P.S. 165	105	12.38	0.95	6.66	19.99
χ^2		1.40*	18.68*	5.76*	.31*
Hunter H.S.	166	3.01	0.60	3.01	6.62
Hunter J.H.S.	95	2.10	4.21	3.15	9.46
χ^2		.20**	4.21**	.01**	.69**

* $\chi^2 \geq 7.815$ required for significance.

** $\chi^2 \geq 3.841$ required for significance.

Use of Force by Peers: Use of force by peers was significantly (χ^2 = 81.69) lower at Mineola High School (1.67%) than at Mineola Junior High (11.20%). But use of force by peers was not significantly (χ^2 = 0.71) lower at Hastings High School (3.31%) than at Hastings Junior High (4.45%). Thus, at suburban schools, no difference was shown between schools at different level.

In the urban schools, the results on reported use of force by peers were equivocal. At Brandeis there was only an insignificantly (χ^2 = 1.40) smaller percentage (9.34%) of use of force reported from peers than at Joan of Arc Junior High (11.67%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, it was almost the same as at P.S. 165 (12.38%). At Hunter High School, there was insignificantly (χ^2 = 0.20) more use of force reported from peers (3.01%) than at Hunter Junior High (2.10%). In general, use of force by peers did not vary systematically with school level in either suburban or urban schools.

Use of Force by Subordinates: In suburban schools, results on use of force by subordinates were not conclusive. At Mineola High School there was about the same (χ^2 = 1.12) amount of use of force by subordinates as at Mineola Junior High. At Hastings High School there was significantly (χ^2 = 98.42) more use of force by subordinates (2.10%) than at Hastings Junior High (0.82%). The number of cases was so small, however (7 and 4 respectively) that little importance can be attributed to the result.

In the urban schools, there appeared to be a weak trend in the direction of more force reported at higher levels of schooling. At Brandeis High School, there was more force reported from subordinates (9.91%) than at Joan of Arc Junior High (3.74%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, more force was reported from subordinates (3.74%) than at P.S. 165 (0.95%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 18.68$). At Hunter High School, there was significantly ($\chi^2 = 4.21$) less use of force by subordinates reported (0.60%) than at Hunter Junior High (4.21%). Again the small number of cases allows little importance to be attributed to the results.

In the urban schools, then, there was no conclusive pattern in the reported use of force by subordinates, just as there was none in the suburban schools.

Use of Force by Authorities: The results on use of force by authorities in the suburban schools were equivocal. At Mineola High School, there was significantly ($\chi^2 = 6.38$) more use of force by authorities reported (10.67%) than at Mineola Junior High (7.46%). At Hastings High School, there was insignificantly ($\chi^2 = 2.14$) less (4.20%) use of force reported from authorities than at Hastings Junior High (6.58%). Thus, there was no systematic difference between the suburban high schools and the suburban junior highs in amount of force from authorities reported.

The results on use of force by authorities in the urban schools were clearer. There was about the same amount of use of force by authorities reported at Brandeis High School (15.01%) and Joan of Arc (15.63%); somewhat less at P.S. 165 (6.66%). The overall differences were not significant ($\chi^2 = 5.76$). At Hunter High School there was about the same ($\chi^2 = 0.01$) amount of force by authorities reported (3.01%) as at Hunter Junior High (3.15%). Thus, in the urban schools, there was no systematic difference with school level in reported force from authorities. In general, no systematic difference in reported use of force by authority was found associated with school level in either suburban or urban schools.

Conclusions: The general finding that there was no clear difference in force associated with school level in either urban or suburban schools tends to support the idea that use of force in the schools is not due to developmental differences between students at different levels of schooling. It may be that school governance rather than student characteristics is the decisive factor in the occurrence or prevention of use of force in the schools.

The findings that reports from peers did not vary with school level seems especially important when compared with the above findings from the content codes of more Out-of-School Social Issues in the junior high schools and the findings from the Relative Status and Personification codes of more conflicts with peers and fewer conflicts with authorities in the junior high schools than in the high schools. If both sets of reports reflect the actual events, they show that more conflicts erupt into physical force when authorities or subordinates are involved than erupt among peers. They may suggest, then, that changes in the governance of the schools which made them more nearly equalitarian can be expected to reduce use of force in the schools.

Affect Categories

Table 17: Cross-Sectional Comparison of Outcome and Tension Levels

Schools	Total Interviewed	Outcome Bad %	Outcome Good %	Tension Level Lowered %
Mineola H.S.	1,311	74.37	6.78	6.17
Mineola J.H.S.	616	56.33	12.01	12.98
χ^2		63.31**	14.82**	25.53**
Hastings H.S.	333	59.45	8.40	10.81
Hastings J.H.S.	471	43.52	18.47	18.47
χ^2		19.81**	16.12**	8.89**
Brandeis	353	67.42	5.94	5.09
Joan of Arc	454	55.06	8.59	6.82
P.S. 165	105	43.80	24.76	25.71
χ^2		23.11*	34.38*	47.88*
Hunter H.S.	166	40.36	10.84	12.65
Hunter J.H.S.	95	38.94	24.21	30.52
2		.05**	8.16**	12.49**

*$\chi^2 \geq$ 7.815 required for significance.

**$\chi^2 \geq$ 3.841 required for significance.

Outcome: As can be seen in Table 17, the results of the assessment of outcome were clear in one respect. In all schools, at all levels, outcome was overwhelmingly more often judged bad than good. In the suburban schools, bad outcomes were more frequently associated with higher school level. At Mineola High School outcomes were judged to be bad significantly ($\chi^2 = 63.31$) more frequently (74.37%) than at Mineola Junior High (56.33%). At Hastings High School outcomes were judged to be bad significantly ($\chi^2 = 19.81$) more often (59.45%). In the urban schools, the trend was in the same direction, but the results were less clear. At Brandeis High School there were more outcomes judged bad (67.42%) than at Joan of Arc Junior High (55.06%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, more outcomes were judged bad than at P.S. 165 (43.80%). At Hunter High School there were insignificantly ($\chi^2 = 0.05$) more outcomes judged bad (40.36%) than at Hunter Junior High (38.94%). Again the special characteristics of Hunter students may account for the anomalous results. At other schools, both urban and suburban, outcomes reported as bad increased with school level.

In the suburban schools there was a clear result in proportion of outcomes judged good at different school levels. At Mineola High School significantly ($\chi^2 = 14.82$) fewer outcomes were judged good (6.78%) than at Mineola Junior High (12.01%). At Hastings High School also significantly ($\chi^2 = 16.12$) fewer outcomes were judged good (8.40%) than at Hastings Junior High (18.47%). Thus, in the suburban schools, the frequency of outcomes judged good was lower at higher school levels.

In the urban schools, the results were also clear. At Brandeis High School fewer (5.94%) incidents judged to have good outcomes were reported than at P.S. 165 (24.76%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 34.38$). At Hunter High School, outcomes were judged good significantly ($\chi^2 = .16$) less often (10.84%) than at Hunter Junior High (24.21%). In general, there were fewer good outcomes at higher levels of schooling in the urban as well as in the suburban schools.

Tension Level: The tension level was described as lowered in a distressingly small proportion of the incidents in all schools. In the suburban schools the results were clear. At Mineola High School, tension level was described as lowered significantly ($\chi^2 = 25.53$) less often (6.17%) than at Mineola Junior High (12.98%). At Hastings High School tension level was described as lowered significantly ($\chi^2 = 8.89$) less often (10.81%) than at Hastings Junior High (18.47%).

In the urban schools the results were equally clear. At Brandeis High School there were fewer incidents reported as resulting in lowered tension level (5.09%) than at Joan of Arc Junior High (6.82%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, there were fewer than at P.S. 165 (25.71%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 47.88$). At Hunter High School there were significantly ($\chi^2 = 12.49$) fewer incidents reported as resulting in lowered tension (12.65%) than at Hunter Junior High (30.52%).

Conclusions: The greater proportions of incidents reported as having bad outcomes, the lower proportions reported as having good outcomes and the lowered tension levels in the higher level schools are mutually confirming results for both urban and suburban schools. All tend to confirm the conclusion that students are more dissatisfied with the governance of their schools as school level increases. Taken together, these results suggest that the need for changes in school governance is greatest in the high schools. The assumption that change can be affected most easily when people are most dissatisfied with the status quo and the finding that dissatisfaction is greatest among high school students lead to the conclusion that the high schools appear to be the logical place to start changing the schools.

Chapter V

URBAN-SUBURBAN COMPARISON

Arlene Richards

High schools and junior highs in both urban and suburban settings were compared; the samples included schools typical of different kinds of communities.

Civic Participation Categories

Dissent: As can be seen in Table 18, Dissent was the label given to about the same proportion of incidents in suburban high schools (53.40%) as in urban high schools (56.90%). The percentage of incidents labeled Dissent from suburban junior high schools (40.91%) was significantly lower than the percentage (44.29%) from urban junior high schools.

Dissent appeared more frequently as school level increased in both suburban schools ($\chi^2 = 52.13$) and urban schools ($\chi^2 = 24.35$).

Equality: A significantly lower ($\chi^2 = 23.24$) proportion of incidents in suburban high schools (39.73%) was labeled Equality than in urban high schools (48.77%). Similarly, a significantly lower ($\chi^2 = 8.30$) proportion of incidents was labeled Equality in suburban junior high schools (42.50%) than in urban junior high schools (49.54%).

Equality was the label attached to the same proportion of incidents at each school level in both suburban and urban schools.

Decision-making: This label was attached to a significantly higher ($\chi^2 = 5.70$) percentage of incidents in suburban high schools (70.80%) than in urban high schools (66.63%). A similar proportion of incidents was so labeled in the suburban (65.31%) and urban junior high school (68.34%).

In suburban schools, the percentage of incidents that could be labeled decision-making was significantly higher in the high school than the junior high; however, this was not the case for urban schools ($\chi^2 = .50$).

Due Process: For suburban high schools, the percentage (36.16%) of incidents labeled Due Process was significantly higher ($\chi^2 = 19.10$) than the percentage (28.27%) of incidents from the urban high schools. For suburban junior high schools, the percentage (51.30%) of incidents labeled Due Process was significantly higher ($\chi^2 = 65.11$) than the percentage (39.12%) from urban junior high schools.

The percentage of incidents labeled Due Process was significantly lower at the high school level than at junior high level in both suburban ($\chi^2 = 77.84$) and urban schools ($\chi^2 = 20.20$).

Conclusions and Implications: Since Decision-making was the most frequently cited category by both urban and suburban students this is clearly the area of democratic participation most urgently in need of change.

Table 18: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Participation Categories Ranked 1 or 2 by Students and Coders

	Total Interviewed		Dissent %	Equality %	Decision-making %	Due Process %
Suburban Sample						
High Schools						
Mineola	1,311	S*	56.43	31.56	83.09	47.51
		C	59.33	31.05	72.89	36.98
New Rochelle	673	S	51.70	46.27	69.04	41.65
		C	54.94	41.67	69.14	33.94
Hastings	333	S	46.80	44.10	81.40	33.80
		C	56.00	34.15	76.10	32.61
Sleepy Hollow	376	S	53.96	52.79	62.50	38.08
		C	50.41	55.09	62.80	31.95
Woodlands	196	S	46.78	49.41	66.66	43.35
		C	42.70	48.95	68.75	40.10
Notre Dame	210	S	34.67	48.74	74.75	45.64
		C	34.15	52.20	74.15	39.51
Freeport	72	S	17.14	59.72	66.20	59.15
		C	20.83	61.11	62.50	55.56
Totals (Coders)	3,171		53.44	39.73	70.80	36.16
Junior High Schools						
Mineola	616	S	41.63	43.56	61.52	62.06
		C	37.21	45.18	58.04	59.63
Hastings	471	S	52.50	38.80	67.90	40.30
		C	47.80	37.40	75.20	38.90
North Salem Middle	79	S	47.06	45.59	64.71	42.65
		C	25.76	53.03	62.12	59.09
Totals (Coders)	1,166		40.91	42.50	65.31	51.30
Urban Sample						
High Schools						
Brandeis	353	S	57.76	53.77	65.57	39.33
		C	62.34	44.62	65.29	28.16
Chas. E. Hughes	146	S	58.82	66.96	64.15	30.85
		C	57.04	58.15	71.83	14.08
Gratz	224	S	57.77	62.35	73.52	46.59
		C	54.38	50.58	66.66	30.40
Hunter H.S.	166	S	54.60	55.79	78.87	29.00
		C	60.86	49.04	63.29	25.31
Franklin K. Lane	64	S	36.96	55.10	68.63	51.92
		C	23.64	60.00	69.09	45.45
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	S	54.85	29.79	78.72	41.67
		C	54.72	30.19	67.92	90.57
Totals (Coders)	1,008		56.90	48.77	66.63	28.27
Junior High Schools						
I.S. 88	144	S	41.58	43.56	50.98	70.09
		C	28.14	47.05	75.73	49.26
Hunter J.H.S.	95	S	63.41	51.85	43.39	17.94
		C	70.00	44.44	66.66	20.00
Joan of Arc	454	S	46.34	48.73	61.76	53.04
		C	43.99	51.40	66.36	39.91
Totals (Coders)	693		44.29	49.54	68.34	39.12

*S = Students. C = Coders.

Dissent was more frequently a problem in high schools. This finding suggests that high school students need a forum for open expression of dissent. Since Equality was cited as the best label for incidents more often among urban students, one can conclude that urban schools will even more likely need to deal with issues of racial, sexual and generational differences than suburban schools. The finding that Due Process was the label attached to fewer incidents than any of the other categories may mean that it occurred least often or that students were least aware of Due Process as a category of democratic participation, as has been noted in the previous studies. The finding that suburban students are more likely to describe Due Process incidents than urban students is puzzling especially in view of the controversy at Franklin K. Lane discussed in the High Schools with Black Students study. The related finding that junior high school students were more likely to describe them than senior high school students suggests that such notions as "fair play," and "equality before the law" are likely to be interesting for junior high school students.

The categories of civic participation have been shown to be unsuitable for use as topics for curriculum "units." They are better used as tools in the analysis of particular incidents as these arise in the context of the individual school.

Content Categories

Political Issues: As can be seen in Table 19, Political Issues were mentioned significantly (χ^2 = 123.57) more by urban (16.17%) than by suburban high school students (5.33%) (^{2} = 123.57). Political Issues were also mentioned significantly (χ^2 = 13.56) more frequently by urban (6.20%) than by suburban junior high school students (2.74%) (χ^2 = 13.56).

Political Issues were more frequently mentioned at the high school level than at the junior high school level by both suburban (χ^2 = 13.00) and urban students (χ^2 = 38.34).

School Governance: Issues of School Governance were mentioned (χ^2 = 165.59) significantly more frequently by suburban (56.98%) than by urban high school students (33.73%). However, at the junior high school level, suburban students mention issues of School Governance 53.69% of the time while urban students mention such issues in 57.14% of their incidents. This difference was not significant (χ^2 = 2.73).

In suburban schools, School Governance issues increased with school level (χ^2 = 3.70); however, in urban schools, School Governance issues decreased significantly with school level (χ^2 = 91.68).

Out-of-School Social Issues: Out-of-School Issues were mentioned less frequently by suburban (6.43%) than by urban high school students (12.80%) and this difference was significant (χ^2 = 42.10). In contrast, Out-of-School Social Issues were mentioned more frequently by suburban (16.90%) than by urban junior high school students (11.54%), a significant (χ^2 = 16.28) difference. Thus, while in suburban schools the mention of Out-of-School Social Issues decreased significantly with an increase in school level (χ^2 = 111.72), in urban schools the mention of these issues increased significantly the higher the school level (χ^2 = 3.75).

Table 19: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Content Codes

Suburban Sample

	Total Interviewed	Courses and Curriculum	Political Issues	Illegal Acts Real or Alleged	Non-Academic School Issues	Out of school Social Issues	Individual Rights
High Schools	#	%	%	%	%	%	%
Mineola	1,311	20.26	1.66	7.81	37.42	4.63	22.24
New Rochelle	673	13.19	10.53	11.01	21.96	7.26	22.56
Hastings	333	6.90	11.11	16.21	20.42	6.30	29.12
Sleepy Hollow	376	9.81	4.67	7.68	31.60	7.95	29.22
Woodlands	196	13.79	9.69	7.65	23.46	7.14	30.09
Notre Dame	210	20.93	0.94	7.42	19.02	9.50	39.02
Freeport	72	0.00	1.38	8.33	25.00	12.50	48.59
Totals	3,171	15.33	5.33	10.41	30.91	6.43	26.08
Junior High Schools							
Mineola	616	4.19	0.96	11.98	33.39	19.46	23.03
Hastings	471	7.43	4.45	13.58	17.62	15.07	32.27
North Salem Middle	79	18.97	6.32	6.32	36.68	7.58	17.68
Totals	1,166	6.52	2.74	12.26	27.27	16.90	26.42
			Urban Sample				
High Schools							
Brandeis	353	12.41	24.33	8.75	19.77	8.20	16.68
Chas. E. Hughes	146	8.18	27.37	10.94	15.71	17.76	12.97
Gratz	224	7.12	8.90	13.80	9.78	24.08	8.01
Hunter	166	30.72	7.22	5.42	24.09	10.29	13.25
Franklin K. Lane	64	12.50	4.68	10.53	32.81	3.12	26.56
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	7.27	3.63	16.36	25.45	1.81	30.90
Totals	1,008	13.40	16.17	10.22	18.65	12.80	15.08
Junior High Schools							
I.S. 88	144	6.24	0.69	4.85	39.55	8.32	33.31
Hunter	95	18.94	23.15	1.05	15.78	17.89	13.68
Joan of Arc	454	7.48	4.40	9.24	31.80	9.02	26.29
Totals	693	8.80	6.20	7.22	31.17	11.54	25.97

Illegal Acts: Illegal Acts were mentioned in 10.41% of the incidents described by suburban high school students and in a similar proportion (10.22%) of the incidents described by urban high school students. Suburban junior high school students mentioned significantly more ($\chi^2 = 11.89$) Illegal Acts (12.26%) than did urban junior high school students (7.22%). Suburban high school students mentioned Illegal Acts less frequently ($\chi^2 = 3.02$) than suburban junior high school students while urban students mentioned Illegal Acts more frequently ($\chi^2 = 4.53$) than urban junior high school students.

Courses and Curriculum: Courses and Curriculum were mentioned in 15.33% of the incidents described by suburban high school students and in 13.40% of the incidents described by urban high school students. Suburban junior high school students mentioned Courses and Curriculum in 6.52% of their incidents, while urban junior high school students mentioned this subject in 8.80% of their incidents. The difference was not significant ($\chi^2 = 3.31$).

Courses and curriculum were mentioned more frequently the higher the school level by both suburban ($\chi^2 = 48.86$) and urban high school students ($\chi^2 = 8.51$).

Conclusions and Implications: The finding that Political Issues were mentioned more frequently by urban than by suburban students indicates that urban students are more likely to be involved and interested in larger political units. Suburban students, on the other hand, seemed to be more interested in issues directly observable in the school.

The finding that Political Issues were more frequently mentioned by high school than by junior high students accords with the finding of the Cross-Sectional study that Political Issues were more frequently mentioned in high schools. These findings suggest that older students are more likely to be ready to be involved in Political Issues larger than school-wide. It does not exclude the possibility that younger students could be stimulated to be more interested in political units larger than the school nor does it imply that older students would be interested in political units larger than the school without stimulation through class discussion.

The finding that School Governance Issues were mentioned more frequently in suburban schools accords with the greater insularity of suburban students mentioned above. The great concern with school governance among suburban high school students indicates that changes in school governance might avert disruption in these schools. If over half the issues in suburban schools concern the governance of the school, suburban school administrators and teachers can expect to both "cool it" in school and educate students for civic participation by making changes in school governance.

The findings on Illegal Acts and Courses and Curriculum suggest that these issues are pertinent in both urban and suburban schools. Courses and Curriculums were of more concern to older students. By including high school students in curriculum planning, school administrators would be helping to meet their expressed needs.

Psychological Process Categories

Interpersonal Involvement

Writer and Protagonist

Distance: As can be seen in Table 20, suburban high school students described incidents in terms of I or We (60.90%) more frequently than did urban high school students (51.69%). This difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 26.76$). Suburban high school students described incidents in terms of He or They (32.17%) less frequently than did urban high school students (36.51%) and this difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 6.30$).

At the junior high school level, suburban students also described incidents in terms of I or We 67.58% significantly more frequently than did urban students (63.64%). At the same time, suburban junior high school students described incidents in terms of He or They (29.25%) also more frequently than did urban junior high school students (25.11%). The difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 3.71$).

The higher the school level, the less frequently incidents were described in terms of I and We in both suburban ($\chi^2 = 16.29$) and urban schools ($\chi^2 = 23.88$); the higher the school level, the more frequently were incidents described in terms of He or They in both suburban ($\chi^2 = 3.38$) and urban schools ($\chi^2 = 24.57$).

Group Size: In suburban high schools (38.76%) of the students described incidents with a single person as protagonist; i.e., I or He. A similar result was found for urban high schools where students described incidents involving a single protagonist (40.87%) of the time. Suburban high school students described incidents involving a group protagonist significantly ($\chi^2 = 14.96$) more often (54.30%) than urban high school students (47.32%).

In suburban junior high schools, students described incidents involving a single person 56.43% of the time. An almost identical result (56.28%) was obtained for urban junior high school students. Suburban junior high school students described incidents involving a group 40.39% of time, significantly more ($\chi^2 = 11.24$) than did urban junior high school students (32.61%).

With increase in school level it was more likely that groups would be involved in the incidents described by both suburban ($\chi^2 = 65.99$) and urban students ($\chi^2 = 36.66$); and less likely that a single person would be involved in both suburban ($\chi^2 = 108.36$) and urban schools ($\chi^2 = 39.13$).

Conclusions: Describing an incident in terms of a distant protagonist was hypothesized as more mature than describing an incident involving oneself. The cross-sectional comparisons in the previous chapter provided some evidence for this hypothesis: the finding that both urban and suburban high school students were more likely to describe incidents in terms of He or They than junior high school students.

The group appeared to be more important to suburban than to urban students. If describing an incident in terms of a distant protagonist as a sign of

Table 20: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement

Suburban Sample

	Total Interviewed	Distance		Group Size	
		I and We	He and They	I and He	We and They
		%	%	%	%
High Schools					
Mineola	1,311	62.46	32.63	34.77	60.32
New Rochelle	673	59.87	31.49	41.00	50.36
Hastings	333	56.14	34.22	25.82	64.56
Sleepy Hollow	376	54.25	33.50	38.03	49.72
Woodlands	196	59.68	33.66	60.70	32.64
Notre Dame	210	66.18	30.46	42.84	53.80
Freeport	72	86.10	13.88	81.94	18.04
Totals	3,171	60.90	32.17	38.76	54.30
Junior High Schools					
Mineola	616	66.06	30.02	57.13	38.95
Hastings	471	71.54	26.32	54.14	43.73
North Salem Middle	79	55.69	40.50	64.55	31.64
Totals	1,166	67.58	29.25	56.43	40.39

Urban Sample

High Schools					
Brandeis	353	52.68	37.95	40.78	49.85
Chas. E. Hughes	146	52.04	41.09	44.51	48.62
Gratz	224	48.21	29.90	43.29	34.84
Hunter	166	48.78	45.17	29.51	64.44
Franklin K. Lane	64	43.74	39.06	51.56	31.24
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	76.36	12.72	43.63	45.45
Totals	1,008	51.69	36.51	40.87	47.32
Junior High Schools					
I.S. 88	144	70.83	22.21	64.58	28.46
Hunter	95	72.62	23.15	55.78	39.99
Joan of Arc	454	59.46	26.42	53.73	32.15
Totals	693	63.64	25.11	56.28	32.61

maturity, the suburban students were more mature in this respect than urban students.

Describing an incident in terms of a group protagonist was also hypothesized to be more mature than describing one in terms of an individual protagonist. The cross-sectional comparisons in the previous chapter supported this hypothesis. The present finding that both suburban and urban high school students were more likely to describe incidents with a group protagonist than junior high school students also confirms this hypothesis. If describing an incident in terms of a group protagonist is a sign of maturity, suburban students appeared to be more mature in this respect than urban students. Thus, suburban students appear to be more mature in their interpersonal perception than urban students. This finding is in no way to be considered normative or an indication of a need for "remediation." In the sense that a human being can be considered an "immature anthropoid" (Lenneberg 1967), one may consider immaturity to be beneficial rather than a detriment to functioning. Since the group appeared to be more important to suburban students, it might be profitable to study separately for urban and suburban students the differences between students who participate in groups and those who do not.

Writer and Antagonist

Relative Status: As can be seen in Table 21, suburban high school students reported more of their incidents as conflicts with authority (74.42%) than with peers (14.54%). Urban high school students also reported more of their incidents as conflicts with authority (59.82%) than as conflicts with peers (21.43%). Overall, suburban high school students reported more conflict with authority than their urban counterparts ($\chi^2 = 79.05$) while reporting less conflict with peers ($\chi^2 = 26.75$).

Suburban junior high school students reported more of their incidents as conflicts with authority (59.52%) than as conflicts with peers (29.93%). Urban junior high school students also reported more of their incidents as conflicts with authority (59.74%) than as conflicts with peers (22.22%). Suburban and urban junior high school students reported about the same percentage of conflicts with authority, but suburban junior high school students saw more conflict with peers than did their urban counterparts ($\chi^2 = 13.08$).

As suburban students progressed in school they tended to report more conflict with authority ($\chi^2 = 90.89$) and less conflict with peers ($\chi^2 = 132.88$). As urban students progressed in school there was no significant change in the amount of conflict they reported as being with peers or authority.

Personification: Suburban high school students reported more of their incidents as conflicts with persons (41.72%) than as conflicts with institutions (29.71%). Urban high school students also reported more of their incidents as conflicts with persons (32.34%) than as conflicts with institutions (25.79%). Overall suburban high school students reported more conflict with persons than did urban counterparts ($\chi^2 = 28.17$); however, there was no significant difference between urban and suburban high school students in the amount of conflict with institution that they reported ($\chi^2 = 5.71$).

Table 21: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Relative Status and Personification

Suburban Sample

	Total Interviewed	Relative Status		Personification	
		Peer	Authority	Person	Institution
		%	%	%	%
High Schools					
Mineola	1,311	9.53	81.69	48.74	28.45
New Rochelle	673	15.60	71.17	30.31	36.55
Hastings	333	18.91	70.27	31.83	33.03
Sleepy Hollow	376	21.54	61.17	32.97	29.78
Woodlands	196	18.36	67.34	46.42	23.97
Notre Dame	210	25.23	77.14	50.47	23.33
Freeport	72	26.38	72.22	73.61	6.94
Totals	3,171	14.54	74.42	41.72	29.71
Junior High Schools					
Mineola	616	32.62	58.27	59.57	12.82
Hastings	471	26.53	60.93	44.16	20.80
North Salem Middle	79	29.11	60.76	54.43	12.66
Totals	1,166	29.93	59.52	53.00	16.04

Urban Sample

High Schools					
Brandeis	353	18.13	66.28	29.74	28.89
Chas. E. Hughes	146	34.24	58.21	34.24	25.34
Gratz	224	22.76	44.19	33.03	17.41
Hunter	166	31.92	56.02	23.49	31.92
Franklin K. Lane	64	9.37	73.43	48.43	18.75
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	9.09	81.81	49.09	30.90
Totals	1,008	21.43	59.82	32.34	25.79
Junior High Schools					
I.S. 88	144	16.66	72.91	77.08	6.25
Hunter	95	35.78	50.52	22.10	14.73
Joan of Arc	454	21.14	57.48	60.13	10.79
Totals	693	22.22	59.74	58.44	10.39

Suburban junior high school students reported more of their incidents as being conflicts with persons (53.00%) than as conflicts with institutions (16.04%). Urban junior high school students also reported more of their incidents as conflicts with persons (58.44%) than as conflicts with institutions (10.39%). Overall, there was no significant difference ($\chi^2 = 5.20$) between urban and suburban junior high school students in the amount of conflict that they reported as being with persons; however, suburban junior high school students reported more conflict with institutions than did their urban counterparts ($\chi^2 = 11.58$).

As suburban students progressed in school they tended to report more incidents as being conflicts with institutions ($\chi^2 = 82.79$) and less incidents as being conflicts with persons ($\chi^2 = 43.87$). Similarly, as urban students progressed in school they tended to report more of their incidents as being conflicts with institutions ($\chi^2 = 62.07$) and less as being conflicts with persons ($\chi^2 = 114.14$).

Alternatives and Convictions

Alternatives: As can be seen in Table 22, in both urban and suburban schools the percentage of students mentioning any alternatives was small. In suburban high schools, 16.99% of the students stated they saw alternatives, and in urban high schools 17.46% of the students stated they saw alternatives. In suburban junior high schools, a significantly ($\chi^2 = 9.32$) higher percentage (23.93%) of the students stated alternatives than in urban junior high schools (17.89%).

In the suburban schools, the frequency with which students say they see alternatives decreases the higher the school level ($\chi^2 = 26.72$). No such difference can be found comparing urban high school students with urban junior high school students.

Convictions: In the suburban high schools 78.76% of those who mentioned alternatives also expressed convictions as a consideration in choosing one course of action over another; while few (21.24%) of those who mentioned alternatives chose between them on the basis of expediency alone. In the urban high schools, a similar result was found, with 87.22% of those who saw alternatives mentioning that a conviction was involved in their choice of action, while only 12.77% said the choice was between expediencies. The proportion of urban high school students who indicated that a conviction was an element in choosing between alternatives was significantly higher ($\chi^2 = 6.26$) than the proportion of suburban high school students who indicated same.

In the suburban junior high schools, most (74.82%) of those who mentioned alternatives also expressed convictions as a consideration in choosing one course of action over another, while only a few (25.18%) of those who mentioned alternatives chose between them on the basis of expediency alone. In the urban junior high schools, a similar result was found; 79.20% of those who saw alternatives mentioned that a conviction was involved in their choice of action while only 20.80% said the choice was only between expediencies. There was no difference between urban and suburban junior high school students in the proportion of students who mentioned conviction as an element in deciding between alternatives. Neither in the suburban school nor urban schools did the mention of conviction vary with school level.

Table 22: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Alternative and Conviction

Suburban Sample

	Total Interviewed	One or More Alternatives %	Conviction %
High Schools			
Mineola	1,311	16.55	64.65
New Rochelle	673	16.19	86.60
Hastings	333	20.42	81.57
Sleepy Hollow	376	10.37	90.24
Woodlands	196	26.53	96.22
Notre Dame	210	24.76	88.46
Freeport	72	2.77	100.00
Totals	3,171	16.99	78.76
Junior High Schools			
Mineola	616	25.16	77.24
Hastings	471	23.99	73.27
North Salem Middle	79	13.92	54.55
Totals	1,166	23.93	74.82

Urban Sample

High Schools			
Brandeis	353	15.01	84.90
Chas. E. Hughes	146	15.75	92.00
Gratz	224	12.50	92.85
Hunter	166	37.35	93.65
Franklin K. Lane	64	12.50	33.33
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	3.63	50.00
Totals	1,008	17.46	87.22
Junior High Schools			
I.S. 88	144	25.69	91.42
Hunter	95	40.00	91.42
Joan of Arc	454	10.79	63.46
Totals	693	17.89	79.20

Conclusions: The high school comparison showed that urban and suburban students did not state alternatives in most of their incidents. To the extent that this represents their inability to see alternatives, it suggests that discussion of one's alternatives would be equally important in urban and suburban settings.

The decrease in reported alternatives in the suburban school level is supported by the findings below that there was more resolution of conflict by unilateral decision of authorities and more use of force by authorities in suburban high schools than in either suburban junior highs or urban high schools. Together, these findings indicate that the lack of alternatives may be an unfortunately accurate appraisal of the realistic situation. If so, the school people who intend to teach students civic behavior might well consider whether providing students with options--real choices--and giving them the freedom to select and pursue alternatives--and to make mistakes--would give them better preparation for citizenship in a democracy than they get from a school in which they have no options.

Urban high school students mentioned convictions in their consideration of alternatives more often than suburban high school students. Kohlberg's (1964) conclusion that the highest stage of moral development is reached when ethical principles are the basis for decision-making rather than more expediency would lead one to surmise from the above finding that the urban students may have been spurred to moral maturation by their greater freedom of choice. It would be most interesting to document such maturation in students deliberately exposed to a series of opportunities to make, act on, evaluate and discuss decisions bearing on the governance of their own school groups.

Conflict Resolution I

Negotiation versus Decision by Authority

Negotiation: The most striking finding in Table 23 is the preponderance of decision by authority in both urban and suburban high schools. Suburban students reported more negotiation than did urban students. Of the incidents reported by suburban high school students, 17.75% were reported as involving attempts at resolving conflict by negotiation. Of the incidents reported by urban high school students, 13.59% were reported as involving attempts at resolving conflict by negotiation. Negotiation was reported significantly more often by suburban than urban high school students.

Suburban junior high school students reported more attempts at negotiation than urban. Of the incidents reported by suburban junior high school students, 21.95% were reported as involving attempts at negotiation, while urban junior high students reported negotiation in 12.26% of their incidents. The difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 9.54$).

Among suburban students the number of attempts at negotiation was a significantly ($\chi^2 = 9.87$) greater percentage in the junior high school. Among urban students this was not the case ($\chi^2 = .64$).

Decision by Authority: At the high school level, there were significantly more incidents terminated by unilateral decision by authorities reported

Table 23: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Negotiation and Decision by Authority

Suburban Sample

	Total Interviewed	Negotiation %	Decision by Authority %
High Schools			
Mineola	1,311	15.02	73.14
New Rochelle	673	16.34	53.93
Hastings	333	20.72	48.94
Sleepy Hollow	376	20.21	46.00
Woodlands	196	18.87	52.55
Notre Dame	210	21.90	73.80
Freeport	72	38.88	56.94
Totals	3,171	17.75	61.40
Junior High Schools			
Mineola	616	23.05	56.65
Hastings	471	20.59	53.92
North Salem Middle	79	21.51	39.24
Totals	1,166	21.95	54.37

Urban Sample

High Schools			
Brandeis	353	9.63	46.74
Chas. E. Hughes	146	21.91	39.04
Gratz	224	12.05	34.37
Hunter	166	19.87	39.15
Franklin K. Lane	64	6.25	60.93
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	12.72	63.63
Totals	1,008	13.59	43.45
Junior High Schools			
I.S. 88	144	7.63	46.52
Hunter	95	24.21	37.89
Joan of Arc	454	11.23	53.74
Totals	693	12.26	45.16

by suburban than by urban students. In suburban high schools, 61.40% of the incidents were reported as terminated by unilateral decision by authorities. In urban high schools, 43.45% of the incidents were reported as terminated by authority decision.

At the junior high school level, the same pattern of more unilateral decision by authority in suburban than in urban schools prevailed. In suburban junior high schools, students reported 54.37% of their incidents as terminated by authority decision. In urban junior high schools, students reported 45.16% of incidents as terminated by authority decision. This difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 75.07$) also.

Among suburban students, termination of incidents by unilateral decision by authorities was significantly ($\chi^2 = 17.47$) higher in the high school. Among urban students, unilateral decision by authorities was not significantly ($\chi^2 = .48$) different in the high schools than in the junior high schools.

Conclusions and Implications: The most striking finding was the preponderance of decision by authority over negotiation at all levels of school and in both urban and suburban schools. Keeping in mind that any attempt at negotiation was considered as negotiation and that unilateral decision by authority was coded for only those cases in which it was the final resolution of the conflict, this finding leads to the conclusion that attempts to resolve conflict by democratic means are not part of students' experience in school. Thus, schools might improve the civic education of their students by increasing attempts at democratic means of conflict resolution.

Since both negotiation and decision by authority are less frequent in urban schools and the other forms of democratic conflict resolution are so rare in both urban and suburban schools, one can only conclude that the problems in democracy in the city schools are less frequently terminated in non-forceful ways than in suburban schools. This leaves open the question of whether they are terminated by force or are unresolved. An attempt to answer this question can be found in the next section of this report, Use of Force.

The finding that in suburban schools students more frequently reported attempts at negotiation, combined with the earlier finding that suburban students were not more mature in their descriptions of incidents, leads to the conclusion that the urban schools are even more undemocratic than the suburban. Increasing school attempts at negotiation seems to be most urgent in urban schools.

The finding that there were more attempts at negotiation in the junior high schools suggests that the out-of-school and peer conflicts reported in junior high schools were more often resolved with negotiation than the conflicts with authority reported in the high schools. This suggests that the students are actually more democratic among themselves than the school is. It argues strongly for the contention that they could make use of the machinery of democratic process if school administrators and teachers were to provide it.

The finding that conflicts were more often terminated by unilateral authority decision in the suburban schools, when taken together with the more frequent use of negotiation in the suburban schools, indicates that the suburban pattern may be to allow some of the forms of democratic participation, but to keep the actual decision making in the hands of authorities.

Finally, the finding that unilateral decision by authorities was more frequent in the high school in the suburbs, but not in the city, leads to the conclusion that reports of unilateral decision-making do not reflect any developmental pattern in students. If the students have perceived their situation correctly, the suburban high school students have been given the least power to make decisions in their own schools. One might expect that as they get older, students become more ready for such decision-making power as well as more in need of practice in making them, since the older students are closer to the time in their lives when they will be eligible to be full citizens in the larger society.

Conflict Resolution II

Use of Force

Total Use of Force: As can be seen in Table 24, of the incidents described by suburban high school students, 16.56% involved use of force by either peers, subordinates or authority. Of the incidents reported by urban high school students 21.92% involved force from either peers, subordinates or authority. The total use of force reported by urban high school students was significantly (χ^2 = 15.01) higher than the amount reported by suburban high school students.

Of the incidents reported by suburban junior high school students, 16.21% involved use of force by either peers, subordinates or authority. In the incidents reported by urban junior high school students, 26.55% involved use of force by either peers, subordinates or authority. The total amount of force reported by urban junior high school students was higher than that reported by suburban junior high school students (χ^2 = 29.06).

Among suburban students the amount of force reported did not vary with school level. Urban junior high school students reported significantly (χ^2 = 4.84) more use of force than urban high school students.

Use of Force by Peers: Suburban high school students reported use of force by peers in 3.63% of their incidents. Urban high school students reported use of force by peers in 5.75% of their incidents. The use of force by peers reported by urban high school students was greater than that reported by suburban high school students (χ^2 = 8.82).

Suburban junior high school students reported use of force by peers in 8.06% of their incidents. Urban junior high school students reported use of force by peers in 10.10% of their incidents. In this category of force there was not much difference between suburban and urban junior high school students (χ^2 = 2.25).

In the sample of suburban students the reported use of force by peers was significantly lower in high school than junior high (χ^2 = 49.03). A similar result was found for the urban student sample (χ^2 = 11.19).

Use of Force by Subordinates: Suburban high school students reported use of force by subordinates in 2.37% of their incidents. Urban high school students reported use of force by subordinates in 9.13% of their incidents, which was significantly higher (χ^2 = 93.41) than the amount reported by suburban high school students.

Table 24: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Use of Force

	Total Interviewed	Peers %	Subordinates %	Authorities %	Total Force %
Suburban Sample					
High Schools					
Mineola	1,311	1.67	1.06	10.67	13.40
New Rochelle	673	5.79	6.09	15.00	26.88
Hastings	333	3.31	2.10	4.20	9.61
Sleepy Hollow	376	6.38	1.32	6.64	14.34
Woodlands	196	4.08	2.04	3.06	9.18
Notre Dame	210	0.95	1.42	11.42	13.79
Freeport	72	12.50	1.38	34.92	48.60
Totals	3,171	3.63	2.37	10.56	16.56
Junior High Schools					
Mineola	616	11.20	1.62	7.46	20.28
Hastings	471	4.45	6.58	0.82	11.85
North Salem Middle	79	5.06	2.53	2.53	10.12
Totals	1,166	8.06	3.68	4.46	16.21
Urban Sample					
High Schools					
Brandeis	353	9.34	15.01	9.91	34.26
Chas. E. Hughes	146	4.79	8.21	8.21	21.21
Gratz	224	5.35	9.82	4.46	19.63
Hunter	166	3.01	0.60	3.01	6.62
Franklin K. Lane	64	1.56	4.68	9.37	15.61
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	0.00	1.81	5.45	7.46
Totals	1,008	5.75	9.13	7.04	21.92
Junior High Schools					
I.S. 88	144	10.41	12.50	0.69	23.60
Hunter	95	2.10	4.21	3.15	9.46
Joan of Arc	454	11.67	15.64	3.74	31.05
Totals	693	10.10	13.42	3.03	26.55

Suburban junior high school students reported use of force by subordinates in 3.68% of their incidents. Urban junior high school students reported use of force by subordinates in 13.42% of their incidents, considerably higher (χ^2 = 60.83) than the amount reported by suburban junior high school students.

In the sample of suburban students the use of force by subordinates was not significantly different (χ^2 = 6.60). In the sample of urban students the use of force did not significantly differ with higher school level either (χ^2 = 7.79).

Use of Force by Authority: Suburban high school students reported use of force by authority 10.56% of their incidents. Urban high school students reported use of force by authority in 7.04% of their incidents. The use of force by authority reported by suburban high school students was significantly higher (χ^2 = 10.83) than the amount reported by urban high school students.

Suburban junior high school students reported use of force by authority in 4.46% of their incidents. Urban junior high school students reported use of force by authority in 3.03% of their incidents. No difference (χ^2 = 2.37) between urban and suburban junior high school students was shown.

In the sample of suburban students the use of force by authority that was reported was significantly increased as the students progressed in school (χ^2 = 39.19). In the sample of urban students a similar result was found (χ^2 = 12.95).

Conclusions: Where difference in force appears to be associated with school level both urban and suburban students are similar. For both urban and suburban students there was less reported use of force by peers the higher the school level; conversely, there was more reported use of force by authority the higher the school level. Neither in total force nor in force by subordinates does there seem to be any difference associated with school level.

The greater reported use of force by peers at lower school level may be attributed simply to the greater frequency of reported conflict with peers at lower school levels. It seems to require no additional explanation.

Use of force by authority accounted for over one half the total use of force reported by suburban high school students; at the same time, use of force by subordinates represented one seventh the total force reported by those same students. Almost the reverse relationship is found in the use of force reported by urban high school students; use of force by authority accounted for less than a third of the total, while use of force by subordinates accounted for almost one half the total force they reported. Since the total use of force reported by suburban high school students was significantly lower than that reported by urban high school students, and since the use of force by authority reported by suburban high school students was significantly higher than that reported by urban high school students it could be concluded that a stronger show of force by authorities reduces the total amount of force used.

One alternative conclusion is that use of force is more common among urban students simply as a function of the greater reliance on non-verbal means of control of behavior in the urban environment. If this is the case, the reported lower frequency of use of force by urban school authorities may reflect an attempt

to inculcate use of verbal means of control of the behavior of others by example among urban school administrators and teachers. The authorities in urban schools may thus be seen as attempting to use more democratic means of conflict resolution.

In view of the finding noted above that there was similar frequency of unilateral decision by authority in the resolution of conflict in urban and suburban schools, the greater use of force by authorities in suburban schools may reflect a greater anticipation of resistance to unilateral decisions by suburban school authorities. The lower frequency of reported use of force by subordinates may thus reflect greater anticipation on the part of suburban authorities of use of force by subordinates than actually occurs. It may be this anticipatory enforcement of authority decision which prevents use of force by subordinates. The anticipation and prevention of use of force by subordinates by suburban authorities may, indeed, be successful. This does not necessarily mean that such use of force would be as successful in preventing use of force by subordinates in urban schools as it seems to have been in the suburban schools. The individual school administrator or teacher may well be tailoring his policies to the requirements of his clientele. The urban student may be more likely to meet force with force than his suburban counterpart.

In any case, the use of force in governing the school raises serious questions about how one educates for citizenship. It is not all clear then that minimization of use of force is an absolute value. Other democratic values such as maximized participation and encouragement of rational dissent may be better served by a school governed in such a way as to encourage selective use of such physical force as striking, sitting-in and the like. Once again it may be important to remember that the category of "force" in this study included non-violent as well as violent use of physical activity. In this context, use of force could be a means of expression of strongly felt dissent which has not been allowed expression in the verbal channels of negotiation. This could also indicate that urban students and suburban authorities who use force more frequently use it to express strong feelings not channeled into negotiation. The urban students use of force may argue for their involvement in school issues. This indication of concern may mean that they are more likely to engage seriously in whatever attempts at negotiation are initiated in the urban schools. The question this brings to mind is how much negotiation has been attempted with urban students, over what issues, and with what results?

Affect Categories

Outcome: As can be seen in Tables 24 and 25 the total proportion of outcomes judged bad was about the same in the urban schools (55.96%) as in the overall sample (61.46%). The proportion of outcomes judged bad was about the same in the suburban schools (62.70%) as in the urban and overall samples. Thus there were no differences between urban and suburban schools in proportion of outcomes judged bad.

The total proportion of outcomes judged bad was not significantly higher for the urban high school students (56.55%) than for the urban junior high school students (55.12%). The total proportion of outcomes judged bad was significantly ($\chi^2 = 133.30$) higher for the suburban high school students (69.91%) than for the suburban junior high school students (51.02%). This finding supports the earlier cross-sectional conclusion that the proportion of bad outcomes

Table 25: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Outcome and Tension Levels

Suburban Sample

	Total Interviewed	Outcome Bad %	Outcome Good %	Tension Level Lowered %
High Schools				
Mineola	1,311	74.37	6.78	6.17
New Rochelle	673	61.36	8.02	8.61
Hastings	333	59.45	8.40	10.81
Sleepy Hollow	376	57.18	6.64	4.52
Woodlands	196	60.71	12.24	6.12
Notre Dame	210	73.80	5.71	5.23
Freeport	72	72.22	4.16	4.16
Totals	3,171	67.07	7.41	6.87
Junior High Schools				
Mineola	616	56.33	12.01	12.98
Hastings	471	43.52	18.47	18.47
North Salem Middle	79	54.43	13.92	15.18
Totals	1,166	51.02	14.75	15.35

Urban Sample

High Schools				
Brandeis	353	67.42	5.94	5.09
Chas. E. Hughes	146	51.36	12.32	10.27
Gratz	224	45.08	10.71	10.26
Hunter	166	40.36	10.84	12.65
Franklin K. Lane	64	67.18	4.68	3.12
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	83.63	1.81	3.63
Totals	1,008	56.55	9.07	8.03
Junior High Schools				
I.S. 88	144	65.97	9.72	11.11
Hunter	95	38.94	24.21	30.52
Joan of Arc	454	55.06	8.59	6.82
Totals	693	55.12	10.96	10.96

increases with level of school. The apparently contradictory result in the urban schools may be attributed to the differences in numbers sampled in the individual schools and the wide variability among schools.

While total proportion of outcomes judged bad was similar for urban and suburban students, the range in each geographical category was wider. The proportion of outcomes judged bad in individual urban schools ranged from a low of 38.94% at Hunter Junior High to a high of 83.63% at William Grady Vocational High School. Similarly, the proportion of outcomes judged bad in individual suburban schools ranged from 43.52% at Hastings Junior High to 74.37% at Mineola High School.

In sum, urban students did differ from suburban, but there were differences associated with school level in both urban and suburban schools and there was a wide range within each category of school in proportion of outcomes judged bad.

The total proportion of outcomes judged good was about the same for the urban students (9.46%) as for the overall sample (9.25%). The proportion of outcomes judged good was about the same for the suburban students (9.99%) as for the urban and overall samples. Thus, there were no differences between urban and suburban students in proportion of outcomes judged good.

The total proportion of outcomes judged good was about the same among the urban high school students (9.07%) as urban junior high students (10.96%). The total proportion of outcomes judged good, however, was significantly (χ^2 = 108.73) lower among suburban high school students (7.40%) than among suburban junior high school students (19.17%). The latter finding supports the conclusion reached in the Cross-Sectional analysis that the proportion of good outcome decreases with school level.

While the total proportion of outcomes judged good was similar for urban and suburban students, the range in each geographical category was wide. The proportion of outcomes judged good in individual urban schools ranged from a low of 4.68% at Franklin K. Lane High School to a high of 24.21% at Hunter Junior High School. Similarly, the proportion of outcomes judged good in individual urban schools ranged from a low of 4.16% at Freeport High School to a high of 18.47% at Hastings Junior High School.

In sum, urban students did not differ from suburban, but there were differences associated with school level in suburban schools and there was a wide range within each category of school in proportion of outcomes judged good.

Tension Level: The total proportion of incidents for which tension level was judged to have been lowered at the conclusion of the incident was almost the same for the urban students (9.21%), for the overall sample (9.14%), junior high (10.96%)--suburban junior high school was 15.35%. The proportion of incidents for which the tension level was judged to have been lowered at the conclusion of the incident was similar for the suburban students (9.15%) as for the overall sample and the urban students. Thus, there were no differences between urban and suburban students in proportion of tension levels judged lowered.

The total proportion of incidents for which tension level was judged lowered was significantly ($\chi^2 = 4.22$) lower among urban high school students (8.03%) than among urban junior high school students (10.96%). The total proportion of incidents for which tension level was judged lowered was also significantly ($\chi^2 = 74.07$) lower among suburban high school students (6.85%) than among suburban junior high school students (15.35%). Both findings support the conclusion reached in the Cross-Sectional analysis that the proportion of lowered tension levels decreases with increased school level.

While the total proportion of incidents for which tension level was judged lowered was similar for urban and suburban students, the range in each geographical category was wide, just as was the case with proportions of outcomes judged good and bad. The proportion of incidents judged to have lowered tension levels in individual urban schools ranged from a low of 3.12% at Franklin K. Lane High School to a high of 30.52% at Hunter Junior High. Similarly, the proportion of incidents judged to have lowered tension levels in individual suburban schools ranged from a low of 4.16% at Freeport High School to a high of 18.47% at Hastings Junior High.

In sum, urban students did not differ from suburban, but there were differences associated with school level in both urban and suburban schools and there was a wide range within each category of school in percentage of incidents judged to have resulted in lowered tension levels.

In addition to the analysis of the affect codes, a descriptive assessment of affect was made. Following are the results of that study.

Suburban Schools

Middle Class: There were three prevalent moods among the students in this category. In one group were the many who were disturbed by the structure of the educational system. They were disgusted with and discouraged by the way the system treated them. They had little faith that the system could work for them. They were angry because they had no power within the system. They wanted to participate and to be given the opportunity to make decisions which affected their lives. Tensions were high among these students. Many were rebellious and anxious for change.

A second group were the apathetic few--bored and uninvolved.

The third mood was reflected by the large minority of students who were aggravated by and angry with the disruptive students. They were satisfied that the system was meeting their needs and had little desire to see changes made. They were responsive to authority and rarely challenged decisions made by authorities. There was a noticeable lack of empathy and ability to articulate their incidents. The anger of these students was directed at their peers or individual teachers and not at the system.

Lower Middle Class High School: These students, as a whole, had strong emotions about the school situation. They reported incidents with less clarity and more emotional content. They were angry because they did not feel respected. They were not given a chance to express their points of view. They were hostile towards teachers who were arbitrary in their actions. They were frustrated because they were powerless to change their situation. Most were resigned and

waiting it out until graduation. There were also a larger number of whining, complaining incidents about personal matters of seemingly little import.

Lower Middle Class Junior High School: There was a greater ambiguity in the feelings of these students. They were sensitive to their powerlessness. They were angry and resentful of arbitrary teacher behavior. They were disgusted with the ways in which they were treated. They asked to be given opportunities to be heard.

On the other hand, they were still submissive to authority. They tended to use teachers as a source of security and as a group were not hostile towards teachers. They did not challenge the system directly but rather were sensitive to concrete incidents which affected them personally.

Urban Schools

Lower and Middle Class Public Schools: The emotional content of protocols from elementary, junior and senior high schools was by far the most consistent in feeling and most alarming in intensity. These students were angry, bitter and rebellious. They were indignant of the injustices they felt they suffered. They were annoyed by their lack of power and frustrated because they were not given a chance to be heard. They were outraged and disappointed with the failure of the educational system to educate them.

They wanted some power to make decisions which affected them and they asked for the common respect due human beings. They were pessimistic about the situation ever being changed. Many were resigned to that fact.

Some were apathetic and bored, feeling alienated from the system and with no role pattern to follow.

Middle-Lower Class, Private, Religious Schools: Again, as a group, these students were consistent in their emotional responses. They were satisfied with the system and not willing to challenge it. They submitted to authority and were content and secure in doing so. Many were apathetic. Some were aware of injustices perpetrated. These students were also angry but did not consider action as an alternative to changing the situation.

Special Urban High School: These students were especially articulate and empathetic. They approached their incidents with greater objectivity and intellectual content. They had a sense of power to be able to change undesirable elements that existed in the school system. They were confident in their beliefs and power and were willing to take risks within the structure to make changes. They were resentful of injustices in the society-at-large. But, again, were not frustrated or resigned. Predictably, the tensions were low, the emotions controlled.

Conclusions: The pervasive high percentage of bad outcomes and low percentage of lowered tension levels lead to the conclusion that many students in all schools visited were dissatisfied with their civic experiences in school. The lack of differences between urban and suburban students in these respects suggest that the physical plants, socio-economic level and other differences between urban and suburban communities and schools are not the crucial factors in

student satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Indeed, the wide range in satisfaction in each type of school argues for the preponderance of local school factors in the extent of satisfaction students feel. The greater dissatisfaction at the high school level suggests that high schools need to change most, and may mean that high school administrators in both cities and suburbs can no longer plead that factors in the students or the community are responsible for the dissatisfaction voiced by their students. On the positive side, the scope of action and possibility for effectiveness of the individual school administrator and teacher is affirmed by these results. The changes a school administrator has within his power to effect can make an important difference in the level of students' satisfaction with their civic experiences in the school.

Bibliography

1. Kohlberg, Lawrence, Development of moral character and moral ideology. In: Hoffman, Martin L. and Lois Hoffman, Review of Child Development Research. New York: Russell Sage, 1964.

Chapter VI

HIGH SCHOOLS WITH BLACK STUDENTS

Arlene Richards and Edward Brussell

Civic Participation Categories

Table 26: High Schools with Black Students: Participation Codes Ranked 1 or 2 by Coders

Distributed by School

Schools	Total Interviewed	Dissent %	Equality %	Decision-making %	Due Process %
Brandeis	353	62.34	44.62	65.29	28.16
Chas. E. Hughes	146	57.04	58.15	71.83	14.08
Franklin Lane	64	25.00	60.00	69.09	47.27
Gratz	224	54.38	50.58	66.66	30.40
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	54.71	30.18	67.92	49.05
Freeport	72	20.83	61.11	62.50	55.55
Woodlands	196	42.70	48.95	68.75	40.10
Overall sample	6,783	46.96	41.03	65.20	37.42

Dissent: In the overall sample (Table 26) coders ranked Dissent as first or second in 46.96% of incidents of dilemmas in democracy. Most schools with black students clustered around similar percentages. Franklin K. Lane (25.00%) and Freeport (20.83%) were notable exceptions. These schools had half as many incidents that could be labelled Dissent. Dissent appeared to have been a less frequent source of dilemmas in democracy at both Franklin K. Lane and the Black Studies Program at Freeport than in the other schools. Whether this reflected the excitement of more freedom to dissent at Lane and Freeport or more incidents were perceived in the other categories of democratic behavior is open to question. The similarity between Lane and Freeport is of interest because of their differences in locale and social climate. Freeport is an integrated suburban school with a good Black Studies Program; Lane is a tortured inner city school with much ill-will between school administration, local community--mostly white--and students.

Equality: Equality was ranked first or second for 41.03% of the incidents in the total sample. Of the schools with black students in our sample only Lane (60.00%), Freeport (61.11%) and Charles Evans Hughes (58.15%) had over 10% more than the total sample. Equality may be seen as an important issue at these three schools. Equality incidents could have crowded out Dissent incidents in these particular places. Whether there are problems in Equality in these schools or whether students just perceived them as such, it amounts to the same thing. If more problems were mentioned in this category, then there were more perceived problems to deal with in Equality experiences.

Decision-making: In the overall sample Decision-making was ranked first or second for 65.20% of the incidents. All schools in the sample with black students had about the same percentage of incidents labelled Decision-making by coders. In addition, Decision-making, the most frequently selected category in the overall sample, was the most frequently selected category for every school in the overall sample of schools with black students. In this way, schools with black students and especially Lane were no different from other schools. Including students in the Decision-making process appeared to be a first priority at Lane, as elsewhere, although the highest reporting of such incidents was at Charles E. Hughes.

Due Process: This category was ranked as first or second for 37.42% of the incidents in the overall sample. This category was most variable in schools with black students. At Lane (47.27%), William Grady Vocational (49.05%) and Freeport (55.55%), it was 10% or more higher than the overall sample. At Charles Evans Hughes it was considerably lower (14.08%). Either Hughes was administered in such a way that Due Process was assured or the particular students interviewed there did not perceive incidents that could be labelled as instances of this issue. At Lane, Due Process was clearly a major issue.

Of interest is the complete parallel between Lane and Freeport on the participation categories. For both schools, Decision-making was most frequently chosen as a label for incidents illustrating dilemmas in democracy, Equality next, Due Process third, and Dissent least frequently. The clearest implication of all this for the governance of Lane is that the Decision-making process must be opened to the students and that issues of Equality and Due Process must be dealt with first in any reform of the governance of the school.

Content Categories

In the overall sample (Table 27), Non-academic School Issues were the most frequently reported (26.96%) content of conflict, while Individual Rights were almost as frequent (24.88%). Taking these categories as the ones most relevant to the governance of the school, one can see that Non-academic Issues in School Governance account for over half the conflict in the schools. Looking at School Governance as a content area comprising both Non-academic School Issues and Individual Rights, it accounted for over half the perceived conflict mentioned by students at Lane (59.37%), at William Grady (56.35%), at Freeport (73.56%), and at Woodlands (53.55%). School Governance issues were less frequently mentioned at Brandeis (36.45%) and Charles Evans Hughes (28.68%). One could speculate that the relative lack of difficulty with School Governance at Brandeis and Hughes freed students to be concerned with larger issues or that the awareness of problems involving larger political units at Brandeis and Hughes drew students' attention away from problems in governance within the schools. A third possible explanation is that violations of Individual Rights occurred less frequently at Brandeis and Hughes. The relative infrequency of Due Process Issues at Hughes (14.08%) and Brandeis (28.16%) tends to support this explanation.

Another striking result in the Content Categories table is the very low proportion of Out-of-School Social Issues mentioned at Lane (3.12%) and Grady (1.81%) in comparison to the overall sample (10.24%) and the other schools with black students (from 7.14% to 24.08%). The concentration on Out-of-School Issues

Table 27: High Schools with Black Students: Content Codes

Distributed by School

Schools	Total Interviewed #	Courses and Curriculum %	Political Issues %	Illegal Acts Real or Alleged %	Non-Academic School Issues %	Out of school Social Issues %	Individual Rights %
Brandeis	353	12.41	24.33	8.75	19.77	8.20	16.68
Chas. E. Hughes	146	8.18	27.37	10.94	15.71	17.76	12.97
Franklin K. Lane	64	12.50	4.68	10.93	32.81	3.12	26.56
Gratz	224	7.12	8.90	13.80	9.78	24.08	8.01
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	7.27	3.63	16.36	25.45	1.81	30.90
Freeport	72	0.00	1.38	8.31	24.97	12.48	48.59
Woodlands	196	13.79	9.69	7.65	23.46	7.14	30.09
Overall Sample	6,783	12.79	6.47	10.23	26.97	10.24	24.88

was shown above* to be characteristic of younger students and accords with observations of early adolescents as compared to older adolescents. By this reasoning, the students at Lane and Grady were showing more mature interests than those at other schools. Alternatively, students at Lane and Grady may have had so many problems with School Governance Issues that fewer Out-of-School Issues came to mind in the school situation.

Out-of-School Social Issues were mentioned more often at Gratz (24.08%) and Hughes (17.76%) than in the overall sample (10.24%) or at other schools with black students. At Gratz, students responded more like junior high school students in that they both less frequently mentioned School Governance Issues and more frequently discussed Out-of-School Social Issues. At Hughes, on the other hand, both Political Issues (27.37%) and Out-of-School Social Issues (17.76%) were mentioned more often than in the general sample. This posed a problem in interpretation. One might conjecture a bimodal population at this school with some very politically mature and aware students and some very immature ones.

Of interest is that at Freeport, where all students interviewed were in a Black Studies program, no conflict was mentioned as resulting from dissatisfaction with Courses and Curriculum. This may be taken as evidence that students here did know what they wanted and were content when they got it. At Woodlands, where a Black Studies program also existed, some dissatisfaction with Courses and Curriculum (13.79%) was still found. This may have been due to the presence of white students on the sample at Woodlands. It might be reasoned that in an integrated school, merely instituting a Black Studies program is not likely to resolve all conflict about Courses and Curriculum. Other curriculum issues need to be explored and evaluated to end dissatisfaction with courses.

Focusing on Lane, School Governance produced so many conflicts (59.37%) that efforts directed at change in this area would seem most useful now. Protection of Individual Rights was a concern of 26.56% of Lane students; Non-academic School Issues were 32.81%. Both are within the legitimate purview of school administrators.

Changes in Courses and Curriculum at Lane may have to involve the central administration of the New York City school system. But open meetings with students may reveal desire for changes that could be effected within the school. In either case, discussion of the issues can only increase the likelihood of meeting the felt needs of students. In sum, school administrators have the power to effect many of the changes students see as necessary and they can reasonably conceive that their efforts have a chance of paying off, since they are not being asked to change social or economic conditions outside their realm of control.

Psychological Process Categories

Interpersonal Involvement

Writer and Protagonist

Distance: Table 28 shows that most (61.32%) incidents reported in the overall sample involved the writer personally either as an individual or as a

---

*In Cross-Sectional and Urban-Suburban Comparisons.

member of a group. At Grady there were (76.36%) and at Freeport (86.11%) incidents involving the writer himself. Students at Lane (43.75%) and Gratz (48.21%) wrote a smaller percentage of incidents in which they were directly involved. Since it had been observed in our other comparative analyses that a lower percentage of personal incidents was associated with increased maturity as reflected in higher school grade, it may be assumed that this was evidence of greater maturity among students at Lane. Again, more students at Lane (46.29%) chose to write about He and They than did students in the total sample (30.98%). This confirms the result in the I or We category, again indicating greater maturity as evidenced by ability to empathize with others.

Table 28: High Schools with Black Students: Interpersonal Involvement

Distributed by School

Schools	Total Interviewed	Distance		Group Size	
		I and We %	He and They %	I and He %	We and They %
Brandeis	353	52.68	37.95	40.78	49.85
Chas. E. Hughes	146	52.04	41.09	44.51	48.62
Franklin Lane	64	43.75	39.08	51.56	31.25
Gratz	224	48.21	29.90	43.29	34.84
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	76.36	12.72	43.63	45.45
Freeport	72	86.11	13.88	81.94	22.22
Woodlands	196	59.68	33.66	60.70	32.64
Overall sample	6,783	61.32	30.98	45.68	46.62

Group Size: The size of the group described had been dichotomized into individual versus larger group. On this basis, the group size in the overall sample was about evenly divided between individuals (45.68%) and groups (46.62%). The only schools with black students which were significantly different from the overall sample were Freeport and Woodlands. Relative immaturity may be indicated by the greater frequency of incidents with individuals as protagonists at Freeport (81.94%) and Woodlands (60.70%) as well as by the lower frequency incidents with groups as protagonists at Freeport (22.22%), Lane (31.25%) and Woodlands (32.64%). Promoting interpersonal involvement in the sense of increasing both the distance at which one describes problems in democracy and the size of the group which is the focus of one's concern as a citizen seems worth doing in any case. Concern for one's group and concern for other individuals and groups are ancient goals of civic education. The findings here suggest that any efforts toward these goals at Lane might well be directed toward increasing the group size dimension since this was the area in which Lane students seemed different from students at other schools. These results may have been obtained by chance, of course, as the students who gave what we have found to be responses more like those of younger children may simply have been more self-involved or not have chosen to give the "more mature" response even though they were capable of doing so if asked.

Writer and Antagonist

Table 29: High Schools with Black Students:
Relative Status and Personification

Distributed by School

Schools	Total Interviewed	Relative Status Peer %	Relative Status Authority %	Personification Person %	Personification Institution %
Brandeis	353	18.13	66.28	29.74	28.89
Chas. E. Hughes	146	34.24	58.21	34.24	25.34
Franklin Lane	64	9.37	73.43	48.43	18.75
Gratz	224	22.76	44.19	33.03	17.41
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	9.09	81.81	49.09	30.90
Freeport	72	26.38	72.22	73.61	6.94
Woodlands	196	18.36	67.34	46.42	23.97
Overall sample	6,783	19.47	67.65	45.65	23.45

Relative Status: As may be noted from Table 29, the overall sample of students described their dilemmas in democracy as occurring with peers in 19.47% of the incidents. The percentage for schools with black students was not significantly different from that of the overall sample. At Lane (9.37%) and William Grady Vocational (9.09%), there were over 10% less peer conflicts reported. Authority, for the overall sample (67.65%) and for each of the schools with black students, was far more frequently mentioned as the opponent in conflict than peers (19.47%) in the overall sample.

Personification: In the overall sample more conflicts were reported as seen with individual persons (45.65%) than with institutions (23.45%). Conflicts with individual persons were reported more often than conflicts with institutions in every one of the schools in the sample having black students also.

At Lane itself there were few conflicts seen as conflicts with the institution (18.75%) as compared with the percentage of conflicts seen with an individual person. Furthermore, the greater percentage of persons was seen as those in authority (73.43%), rather than peers (9.37%). Yet newspaper reports of the rioting at Lane at the time, indicate that there was overt violence between black and white students at Lane. It could be speculated that the violence between students was due to the difficulty of getting to a person in authority, and the more ready outlet was to vent anger upon peers. (It may be noted that anger against institutions might be easier to express in terms of strikes, sit-ins, and the like.) The release of hostile feelings on peers did not seem to lead the students to express the conflict as primarily a peer-peer one.

Alternatives: Table 30 shows that in the overall sample, only 18.22% of students mentioned alternatives to what had happened in the incidents they described. For 81.77% there were no alternatives mentioned. Students in the sample schools with black students mentioned alternatives as infrequently as the overall sample,

except for Woodlands (26.53%) which was higher than the overall sample and Grady (3.63%) and Freeport (2.77%) which were lower. The preponderance of no alternatives at most schools in the whole picture was the most salient finding here. The failure to mention alternatives, to the extent that it indicates an inability to see them, is bound to restrict a person's choices of actions.

Table 30: High Schools with Black Students: Alternatives and Conviction

Schools	Total Interviewed	One or More Alternatives %	Conviction %
Brandeis	353	15.01	84.90
Chas. E. Hughes	146	15.75	92.00
Franklin Lane	64	12.50	33.33
Gratz	224	12.50	92.85
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	3.63	50.00
Freeport	72	2.77	100.00
Woodlands	196	26.53	96.22
Overall sample	6,783	18.22	79.87

Convictions: The smaller number of students mentioning any alternatives was divided into those who expressed convictions as a basis for their choice, and those who did not. In the overall sample, most of those who mentioned alternatives also expressed convictions as the basis for choosing one course of action over another (79.87%). There were comparatively few (20.12%) who mentioned alternatives and chose between them on the basis of expediency alone. In individual schools, the numbers were too low to permit an analysis.

For the overall sample, the students were for the most part choosing an alternative on the basis of the convictions rather than for the sake of expediency. The problem is, however, that a student who sees no alternative course of action is, in essence, being forced into one type of behavioral act; his action was not chosen on the basis of ideals or expediency, but because he could not think of anything else to do. Students have the ideals; they need to be helped to see alternatives from which they can choose one that most closely aligns itself with their convictions.

Conflict Resolution I

Negotiation versus Decision by Authority

Negotiation: As can be seen from Table 31, Negotiation was infrequently reported (16.60%) as a means of conflict resolution in the overall sample. At Freeport the percentage of reported incidents was 38.88%. Negotiation was mentioned significantly less frequently at Lane (6.25%).

Decision-making: In the overall sample the percentage of reported incidents was 55.32%. It was mentioned less often at Brandeis (46.74%), Hughes (39.04%) and Gratz (34.37%). At Lane the percentage was 60.93%, although Grady

was even higher (63.63%). The spread between negotiation and decision by authority was greater at Lane than at any other schools in the sample.

Table 31: High Schools with Black Students:
Negotiation and Decision by Authority

Distributed by School

Schools	Total Interviewed	Negotiation %	Decision by Authority %
Brandeis	353	9.63	46.74
Chas. E. Hughes	146	21.91	39.04
Franklin Lane	64	6.25	60.93
Gratz	224	12.05	34.37
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	12.72	63.63
Freeport	72	38.88	56.94
Woodlands	196	18.87	52.55
Overall sample	6,783	16.60	55.32

An assumption might be made that the low incidence of decision by authority at Hughes and Gratz was related to the relatively large number of peer conflicts at these schools.

The most striking finding in this table, the wide spread between negotiation and decision by authority, could easily lead one to predict that much tension would be generated at these schools. School administrators could conclude from this table that negotiation is not the model of conflict resolution students perceive as presently used in schools. The administrator who wants to use negotiation can probably expect to be considered innovative, if not radical or revolutionary, by students.

Conflict Resolution II

Use of Force

As can be seen in Table 32, in the overall sample the number of descriptions of force from peers, authorities, and subordinates was 18.92% of the number of incidents. The sample of schools with black students varied widely here. Relatively little force was reported at Grady (7.26%) and Woodlands (9.18%) while much more was reported at Freeport (48.60%).

Force from peers ranged from 12.50% at Freeport to 0.00% at Grady as compared with the overall sample (5.54%). Peer force was reported in 1.56% of conflicts at Lane. Thus, Lane and Grady were alike in having a low incidence of peer-peer force reported. Force from subordinates designated force directed by students against teachers or administrators. Little of this was reported in the overall sample (2.83%), more at Brandeis (15.01%), Gratz (9.82%) and Hughes (8.21%).

Table 32: High Schools with Black Students: Use of Force

Distributed by School

Schools	Total Interviewed	Peers %	Subordinates %	Authorities %	Total Force %
Brandeis	353	9.34	15.01	9.91	34.26
Chas. E. Hughes	146	4.79	8.21	8.21	21.21
Franklin K. Lane	64	1.56	4.68	9.37	15.61
Gratz	224	5.35	9.82	4.46	19.63
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	0.00	1.81	5.45	7.26
Freeport	72	12.50	1.38	34.72	48.60
Woodlands	196	4.08	2.04	3.06	9.18
Overall sample	6,783	5.54	2.83	10.55	18.92

Force from authority was mentioned as a means of conflict resolution far more often (10.55%) than violence from peers (5.54%) or subordinates (2.83%) in the overall sample. In the perception of students generally, forceful imposition of authority from above was the most frequent kind of force conflict resolution. At Freeport, force from authorities was more frequently mentioned (34.72%) than in the overall sample. It was reported less often at Woodlands (3.06%), Gratz (4.46%), and Grady (5.45%) than in the overall sample.

Focusing on Lane, where violence in the school had been making the news, force from peers was reported (1.56%) less often than force from subordinates (4.68%) which is in turn reported less often than force from authorities (9.37%).

Social psychology, ethology and commonsense all suggest that one is likely to prepare to use force when he perceives others using it or likely to use it against him. The image of authority as prone to use force has proved to be a dangerous one in a nationwide spread of violence in schools and on campuses in the months that have followed our survey. De-escalation from the level of force to the level of rational negotiation may be easier to achieve when authorities are not seen as more prone to direct force against students than students are to other students or to the authorities themselves.

Outcome and Tension Level

Outcome: Table 33 shows that in the overall sample outcome was rated as bad in 59.48% of the incidents. In relatively few cases (14.00%) was outcome rated good. The remainder were intermediate. Dissatisfaction with the outcome was higher at Grady (83.63% called bad) and Freeport (72.22% called bad). It was lower at Gratz (45.08%).

The satisfaction level may have been a function of student expectation as well as the outcome. More demanding students would then be dissatisfied with outcomes that less demanding students would find good. This makes comparisons between schools in this category difficult to interpret.

Table 33: High Schools with Black Students:
Outcome and Tension Levels

Distributed by School

Schools	Total Interviewed	Outcome Bad %	Outcome Good %	Tension Level Lowered %
Brandeis	353	67.42	5.94	5.09
Chas. E. Hughes	146	51.36	12.32	10.27
Franklin Lane	64	67.18	4.68	3.12
Gratz	224	45.08	10.71	10.26
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	83.63	1.81	3.63
Freeport	72	72.22	4.16	4.16
Woodlands	196	60.71	12.24	6.12
Overall sample	6,783	61.46	9.25	9.14

Tension Level: In the overall sample tension level was rated as raised in 57.76% of reported incidents while it was rated lowered in only 9.14%. At Grady it was higher (74.54%), while Lane (70.31%) and Freeport (69.44%) were also higher than the overall sample. Tension was lowered less often at Brandeis (5.09%) Freeport (4.16%), Grady (3.63%) and Lane (3.12%) than in the total sample. One would expect these to be the more explosive schools. Lane and Freeport certainly bore out that expectation in the spring of 1969 and Lane again with sporadic outbreaks in the following months. The tension was predicted at Lane and Grady as a result of the great spread between negotiation and decision by authority. At Lane, the tension, perceived as conflict with authority as represented by persons rather than abstract institutions, could not be directed against those persons themselves. Instead, groups of students took to fighting one another. At least part of the "racial" conflict that finally erupted between students was likely to have been driven by the hostility re-directed from the unavailable original targets to more available substitutes.

Which leaves the question of why Grady, so similar to Lane in so many of the ways sketched above, has been relatively free of conflict. Several explanations are possible. First, Grady is a vocational school. Students are selected to attend. There are screening procedures and admissions requirements. Some potential trouble-makers may be screened out before they ever get there. Second, as a vocational school, Grady may be able to transfer troublesome students out to general high school programs more easily. Third, the mix of students is less diverse at Grady than at an academic high school. In short, Grady seems to be like the traditional inadequate slum high school which got rid of problems by refusing to educate those students who were not willing to "go along with the system." Lane must accept and is expected by society to refrain the rebellious high spirited students as well as the docile ones. Lane is more diverse, more troublesome, less fully equipped with safety values and defensive devices, but potentially more exciting school to work or study in. If in the enforced diversity and old recriminations of Lane, participatory democracy can be used to teach citizenship by an apprenticeship in school governance, maybe any school could move and change and grow up to the challenges of its students and its society.

Chapter VII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERPERSONAL ASPECT OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

Arlene Richards and Josephine Harrison

Decentering: Piaget's theory that as children develop, the most fundamental change in cognitive functioning is beginning to see events from a point of view other than one's own. His term for this phenomenon is "decentering." The infant accomplishes decentering in the sensori-motor realm of physical action. The young child recapitulates the process in the concrete operation by which he accompanies and replaces physical action with descriptive language. According to Inhelder and Piaget (1958) a third recapitulation of the decentering process is the essential task of adolescence. The adolescent accomplishes decentering in the realm of formal thought which encompasses future contingencies and thinking about thinking. Decentering is a change that shows itself in cognitive structures, or ways of thinking, and in social cooperation or ways of living with other people. The decentering of social relations evolves in the process of differentiating one's wishes and values from other people's; planning and assuming future adult work roles, and changing the society in which one lives.

Among the changes that occur are:

1. the development of "ideals,"
2. the differentiation of one's own from others' viewpoints, and
3. the enlargement of one's social horizon.

The first of these, the development of ideals, has been studied by Kohlberg (1964) and Turiel (1969). The second and third of these were explored in the present study. The second is achieving a variety of points of view, as described by Inhelder and Piaget (1958, p. 345).

> Essentially, the process, which at any one of the development stages moves from egocentrism toward decentering, constantly subjects increases in knowledge to a refocusing of perspective. Everyone has observed that the child mixes up subjective and objective facts, but if the hypothesis of egocentrism did nothing more than restate this truism it would be worth next to nothing.[6] Actually, it means that learning is not

---

[6] Translator's note: This passage refers to an opinion more prevalent in Europe than in America, namely that the author's work simply demonstrates a normative view of the child as an irrational creature. In the United States, where problems of motivation are more often given precedence over purely intellectual functions both from the normative standpoint and in psychological research, another but parallel misinterpretation has sometimes been made; namely, that in maintaining that the child is egocentric, the authors have neglected the fact that he is capable of love. It should be made clear in this section that egocentrism best understood from its root meaning--that the child's

a purely additive process and that to pile one new learned piece of behavior or information on top of another is not in itself adequate to structure an objective attitude. In fact, objectivity presupposes a decentering--i.e., a continual refocusing of perspective. Egocentrism, on the other hand, is the undifferentiated state prior to multiple perspectives, whereas objectivity implies both differentiation and coordination of the points of view which have been differentiated.

Protagonist and Antagonist

FIGURE 1

Interpersonal Involvement of Writer and Protagonist of the Incident

Group Size \ Distance	Near	Far
Individual	I	He
Group	We	They

FIGURE 2

Interpersonal Involvement of Writer and Antagonist of His Incident

Personification \ Relative Status	Near	Far
Individual	Peer	Authority
Group	Peer group	Institution

The four aspects of interpersonal involvement that could be induced from our data were investigated. They are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2. Figure 1 shows the aspects of interpersonal involvement derived from the students' description of the protagonist in his incident; Figure 2 shows those aspects of interpersonal involvement derived from the students' description of the antagonists. Figure 1 shows the dimensions here labelled "Distance and Group Size." Figure 2 shows those labelled "Relative Status and Personification." By comparing Figures 1

---

perception is cognitively "centered on his own ego" and thus lacks a certain type of fluidity and ability to handle a variety of perspectives--is not to be confused with "selfish" or "egoistic."

and 2, it can be seen that they depict parallel dimensions of interpersonal involvement.

Distance

Table 34: Distance and Group Size

	Protagonist	Percent	Number
Distance:	I and We	61.32	4,160
	He and They	30.98	2,102
Group Size:	I and He	45.68	3,099
	We and They	46.62	3,163
		92.30	6,262

One aspect of the ability to comprehend other points of view is represented by interpersonal Distance in this study. Distance was operationally defined as using He or They as the protagonist of the incident when asked to describe a dilemma in democracy.* It is the horizontal dimension shown in Figure 1. The larger the proportion of children at an age level discussing issues in terms of He and They, the more of them are capable of seeing things from another point of view. As can be seen in Table 34, in the overall sample, only 30.98% of the incidents were described as having a distant protagonist, He or They. Thus, most students were concerned with personal, not distant problems.

Cross-Sectional Study of the Schools in Four Communities

In the suburban schools, this contrast yielded equivocal results. As seen in Table 35, fewer students at Mineola High (62.46%) described incidents in terms of I or We than students at Mineola Junior High (66.06%), and more frequently in terms of He or They (32.63%) than students at Mineola Junior High (30.03%), but the differences, although in the predicted direction, were not significant. Fewer students at Hastings High School (56.14%) described incidents in terms of I or We than at Hastings Junior High (71.54%) and more in terms of He or They (34.22%) than at Hastings Junior High (26.32%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 8.76$).

---

*The possibility that the contrast could have been structured as I versus We, He and They was considered and discarded on two grounds. First, it would confound the two linguistically distinct qualities of person and number which correspond to our distance and group size. Second, it is one of the great tasks of adolescence to define the relationship with the group, to separate one's own interests from those of the other members of one's group. If the adolescent has not yet clearly separated I or We, it seemed the more conservative procedure would be to see him as achieving Distance only when he spoke of the clearly differentiated He or They.

Table 35: Cross-Sectional Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement I

Protagonist

School	Total Interviewed	Distance I and We %	Distance He and They %	χ^2
Suburban:				
Mineola H.S.	1,311	62.46	32.63	
Mineola J.H.S.	616	66.06	30.02	
				1.71*
Hastings H.S.	333	56.14	34.22	
Hastings J.H.S.	471	71.54	26.32	
				8.76*
Urban:				
Brandeis	353	52.68	37.95	
Joan of Arc	454	59.46	26.42	
P.S. 165	105	80.94	12.37	
				26.79**
Hunter H.S.	166	48.78	45.17	
Hunter J.H.S.	95	72.62	23.15	
				13.78*
Overall sample	6,783	61.32		
				30.98

* value $\geq$ 3.841 required for significance.

** value $\geq$ 7.815 required for significance.

In the city schools, students at Brandeis (52.68%) described incidents less frequently in terms of I or We than students at Joan of Arc Junior High (59.46%); students at Joan of Arc, in turn, used I or We less frequently than students at P.S. 165 (80.94%). Students at Brandeis (37.95%) also used He and They more frequently than students at Joan of Arc (26.42%); students at Joan of Arc, in turn, used He or They more frequently than those at P.S. 165 (12.37%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 26.79$). Students at Hunter High School (48.78%) used I or We less frequently than students at Hunter Junior High School (72.62%). Students at Hunter High (45.17%) also used He or They more frequently than students at Hunter Junior High (23.15%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 13.78$). In sum, all comparisons were in the predicted direction and all but one were significant. The higher the school level, the more likely students were to describe incidents involving others rather than themselves.

Urban-Suburban Comparison of Schools

As can be seen in Table 36, suburban high school students (60.90%) described incidents in terms of I or We more frequently than did urban high school students (51.69%), and this difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 26.76$). Suburban high school students (32.17%) described incidents in terms of He or They less frequently than did urban high school students (36.51%) and this difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 6.30$).

Table 36: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement I

Protagonist

	Total Interviewed	Distance I and We %	He and They %
Suburban Sample			
High Schools			
Mineola	1,311	62.46	32.63
New Rochelle	673	59.87	31.49
Hastings	333	56.14	34.22
Sleepy Hollow	376	54.25	33.50
Woodlands	196	59.68	33.66
Notre Dame	210	66.18	30.46
Freeport H.S.	72	86.10	13.88
Totals	3,171	60.90	32.17
Junior High Schools			
Mineola	616	66.06	30.02
Hastings	471	71.54	26.32
North Salem Middle	79	55.69	40.50
Totals	1,166	67.58	29.25
Overall Sample	6,783	61.32	30.98
Urban Sample			
High Schools			
Brandeis	353	52.68	37.95
Chas. E. Hughes	146	52.04	41.09
Gratz	224	48.21	29.90
Hunter	166	48.78	45.17
Franklin K. Lane	64	43.74	39.06
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	76.36	12.72
Totals	1,008	51.69	36.51
Junior High Schools			
I.S. 88	144	70.83	22.21
Hunter	95	72.62	23.15
Joan of Arc	454	59.46	26.42
Totals	693	63.64	25.11
Overall Sample	6,783	61.32	30.98

At the junior high school level, suburban students (67.58%) also described incidents in terms of I or We significantly more frequently than did urban students (63.64%). At the same time, suburban junior high school students (29.25%) described incidents in terms of He or They also more frequently than did urban junior high school students (25.11%), and this difference was significant ($\chi^2 = 3.71$).

The higher the school level, the less frequently incidents were described in terms of I or We in both suburban ($\chi^2 = 16.29$) and urban schools ($\chi^2 = 23.88$); the higher the school level, the more frequently were incidents described in terms of He or They in both suburban ($\chi^2 = 3.38$) and urban schools ($\chi^2 = 24.57$).

High Schools with Black Students

Table 37: High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Interpersonal Involvement I

		Protagonist Distance	
School	Total Interviewed	I and We %	He and They %
Brandeis	353	52.68	37.95
Chas. E. Hughes	146	52.04	41.09
Franklin K. Lane	64	43.75	39.08
Gratz	224	48.21	29.90
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	76.36	12.72
Freeport	72	86.10	13.88
Woodlands	196	59.68	33.66
Overall sample	6,783	61.32	30.98

As can be seen in Table 37, most incidents (61.32%) reported in the overall sample involved the writer personally either as an individual or as a member of a group. At Grady there were 76.36% and at Freeport 86.10% incidents involving the writer himself. Students at Lane (43.74%) and Gratz (48.21%) wrote a smaller percentage of incidents in which they were directly involved. Since it has been shown thus far in our study that a lower percentage of personal incidents is associated with increased maturity as reflected in higher school grade, one may speculate that this was evidence of greater maturity among students at Lane and Gratz. While Brandeis (52.68%), Hughes (52.04%) and Woodlands (59.68%) reported percentages higher than Lane and Gratz, they were, nevertheless, a little lower than the overall sample (61.32%). More students at Lane (39.08%), Brandeis (37.95%), and Hughes (41.09%) chose to write about He and They than did students in the total sample (30.98%), and while Woodlands reported 33.66%, it was not conspicuously higher than the overall sample. The high percentage (86.10%) noted for I or We at Freeport was counterbalanced by the very low percentage reported for He or They (13.88%). This appears to confirm the result in the I or We category, indicating greater maturity as evidenced by ability to empathize with others.

Educational Level Comparison

As noted in Table 38 at most schools, incidents were reported in terms of I or We about as often as in the overall sample (61.32%) and in the expected direction of fewer I and We incidents the higher the school level; there were significant differences between the individual schools. In the high schools, the lowest percentage reported was at Franklin K. Lane, an urban school (43.74%); the highest was at suburban Freeport (86.10%). For the junior high schools, the lowest percentage reported was at North Salem Middle, a suburban school (55.69%), while the highest was at Hunter Junior High, an urban school (72.62%), although suburban Hastings (71.54%) was very close to Hunter.

The elementary school sample was small and the data cannot be assumed to be comparable with the larger volume of data for the junior and high schools, although the data we have support the hypothesis of greater maturity with less reporting of I or We. Suburban Baldwin (69.75%) was close to the overall sample (61.32%) although higher; urban P.S. 179 (50.00%) was within the 10% span around the overall sample, although lower. Of interest in this data is the broad span of 30.94% between P.S. 165 and P.S. 179, since both are not only urban schools, but within a few blocks of each other in a community of mixed black and Puerto Rican students. Our data suggest that the differences between schools are not ones of physical location but of the individual climate of a given school.

The data for reported incidents as He or They assumed a clear pattern of increasing awareness from the lower grades to the higher. With the exceptions of Freeport (13.88%) and Grady (12.72%), the high schools are equal to the overall sample (30.98%) or above it, the highest being Hunter (45.17%) followed by Hughes (41.09%). The junior high percentages tended to be slightly less than the overall sample of 30.98% as noted by such examples as Hastings (26.32%), Joan of Arc (26.42%), Hunter (23.15%) and I.S. 88 (22.21%). The suburban school of Mineola (30.02%), however, was almost identical to the overall and the suburban school of North Salem Middle (40.50%) was 10% higher than the overall. At the elementary school level there was quite diverse reporting. At P.S. 165, the percentage of awareness of others outside one's own self concern was very low (12.37%); at P.S. 179 (46.87%) the difference between the overall was by 16% and Baldwin was comparable to the overall sample with 30.22%.

Between predominantly white schools and predominantly black schools, the data indicate no significant differences in this category of Distance except for the differences between individual schools, as noted above, and particularly differences within the predominantly black schools.

In the overall sample significantly ($\chi^2 = 71.63$) more students who discussed their incidents in terms of He or They rather than I or We mentioned an institutional antagonist. Thus, the less Distance, the fewer conflicts with Institutions were mentioned.

Group Size

Inhelder and Piaget (1958) emphasized the importance of "social roles and scales of values derived from social interaction (and no longer by coordination of exchanges which they maintain with the physical environment and other individuals)." This statement can be read in terms of the individual coming to relate

Table 38: Educational Level Comparison: Interpersonal Involvement I

Progatonist

	Total Interviewed	Distance I and We %	He and They %
High Schools			
Urban:			
Chas E. Hughes	146	52.04	41.09
Franklin K. Lane	64	43.74	39.06
Hunter	166	48.78	45.17
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	76.36	12.72
Brandeis	353	52.68	37.95
Gratz	224	48.21	29.90
Suburban:			
Hastings	333	56.14	34.22
New Rochelle	673	59.87	31.49
Mineola	1,311	62.46	32.63
Sleepy Hollow	376	54.25	33.50
Woodlands	196	59.68	33.66
Freeport	72	86.10	13.88
Notre Dame	210	66.18	30.46
Overall Sample	6,783	61.32	30.98
Elementary Schools			
P.S. 165	105	80.94	12.37
P.S. 179	32	50.00	46.87
Baldwin	43	69.75	30.22
Junior High Schools			
Hastings	471	71.54	26.32
Mineola	616	66.06	30.02
North Salem Middle	79	55.69	40.50
Joan of Arc	454	59.46	26.42
Hunter	95	72.62	23.15
I.S. 88	144	70.83	22.21
Overall Sample	6,783	61.32	30.98

to larger groups as he matures or in terms of his coming to view groups in more abstract terms as he develops. Both were investigated in the present study; relating to larger groups was investigated in terms of group size, as shown in Figure 1. Relating to a more abstract conception of groups was investigated in terms of the group versus institution dimension shown in Figure 2. One hypothesis the present author derived from this theoretical statement is that older students would be more likely to describe the protagonist of their incidents as groups. Operationally, the proportion of students describing incidents in terms of I or He was taken to represent the proportion of students' social thinking of individuals rather than groups. The proportion describing incidents in terms of We or They was taken to represent the propcrtion thinking of groups rather than individuals. That is the vertical dimension in Figure 1. This hypothesis was tested in all four of the comparisons reported in this analysis. In the overall sample, about the same percentage of students wrote incidents in terms of I or He as in terms of We or They. Thus, individual group issues were equally salient for the students.

Cross-Sectional Study of the Schools in Four Communities

Table 39: Cross-Sectional Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement I

School	Protagonist: Total Interviewed	Group Size: I and He %	Group Size: We and They %	χ^2
Suburban				
Mineola H.S.	1,311	34.77	60.32	
Mineola J.H.S.	616	57.13	38.95	80.00*
Hastings H.S.	333	25.82	64.56	
Hastings J.H.S.	471	54.14	43.73	52.00*
Urban				
Brandeis	353	40.78	49.85	
Joan of Arc	454	53.73	32.15	
P.S. 165	105	63.80	29.51	22.51**
Hunter H.S.	166	29.51	64.44	
Hunter J.H.S.	95	55.78	39.99	17.08*
Overall sample	6,783	45.68	46.62	

* value $\geq$ 3.841 required for significance

** value $\geq$ 7.815 required for significance

As can be seen in Table 39, in the suburban schools, this comparison yielded unequivocal results. Students at Mineola High School described incidents involving a single person I or He less often (34.77%) than students at Mineola Junior High (57.13%). Students at Mineola High also described incidents in terms of a group more often (60.32%) than students at Mineola Junior High (38.95%).

The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 80.00$). Students at Hastings High School described incidents in terms of I or He less often (25.82%) than students at Hastings Junior High (54.14%). Students at Hastings High also described incidents in terms of We or They more often (64.56%) than students at Hastings Junior High (43.73%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 8.76$).

In the city schools, this comparison also yielded unequivocal results. At Brandeis High, students described incidents in terms of I or He less often (40.78%) than students at Joan of Arc Junior High (53.73%); students at Joan of Arc, in turn, used I or He less often than students at P.S. 165 (63.80%). Students at Brandeis (49.85%) described incidents in terms of We or They more often than students at P.S. 165 (29.51%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 22.51$). Students at Hunter High School (29.51%) described incidents in terms of I or He less often than students at Hunter Junior High School (55.78%). Students at Hunter High also described incidents in terms of We or They more often (64.44%) than students at Hunter Junior High (39.99%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 17.08$). In sum, all differences were significant and in the predicted direction. One can conclude that the size of the group with which students were concerned increased with higher school level.

Urban-Suburban Comparison of Schools

As can be seen in Table 40, in suburban high schools 38.76% of the students described incidents with a single person as protagonist, i.e., I or He. A similar result was found for urban high schools where students described incidents involving a single protagonist 40.87% of the time. Suburban high school students described incidents involving a group protagonist significantly ($\chi^2 = 14.96$) more often (54.30%) than urban high school students (47.32%).

In suburban junior high schools, students described incidents involving a single person 56.43% of the time. An almost identical result (56.28%) was obtained for urban junior high school students. Suburban junior high school students described incidents involving a group 40.39% of the time, significantly more ($\chi^2 = 11.24$) than did urban junior high school students (32.61%).

With increase in school level it was more likely that groups would be described as the protagonist in their incidents by both suburban ($^2 = 65.99$) and urban students ($\chi^2 = 36.66$), and less likely that a single person would be described as the protagonist in both suburban ($\chi^2 = 108.36$) and urban schools ($\chi^2 = 39.13$).

High Schools with Black Students

As can be seen in Table 41, the group size in the overall sample is about evenly divided between individuals (45.68%) and groups (46.62%). The only schools with black students which were significantly different from the overall sample were Freeport and Woodlands. Relative immaturity may be indicated by the greater frequency of incidents with individuals as protagonists at Freeport (81.94%) and Woodlands (60.70%) as well as by the lower percentage of incidents with groups as protagonists at Freeport (22.22%), Lane (31.25%) and Woodlands (32.64%). Promoting interpersonal involvement in the sense of increasing both the distance at which one described problems in democracy and the size of the group which is the focus of one's concern as a citizen seems worth doing in any case. Concern for one's

Table 40: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement I

Protagonist

	Total Interviewed	Group Size I and He %	We and They %
Suburban Sample			
High Schools			
Mineola	1,311	34.77	60.32
New Rochelle	673	41.00	50.36
Hastings H.S.	333	25.82	64.56
Sleepy Hollow	376	38.03	49.72
Woodlands	196	60.70	32.64
Notre Dame	210	42.84	53.80
Freeport H.S.	72	81.94	18.04
Totals	3,171	38.76	54.30
Junior High Schools			
Mineola	616	57.13	38.95
Hastings	471	54.14	43.73
North Salem Middle	79	64.55	31.64
Totals	1,166	56.43	40.39
Overall Sample	6,783	45.68	46.62
Urban Sample			
High Schools			
Brandeis	353	40.78	49.85
Chas. E. Hughes	146	44.51	48.62
Gratz	224	43.29	34.84
Hunter	166	29.51	64.44
Franklin K. Lane	64	51.56	31.24
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	43.63	45.45
Totals	1,008	40.87	47.32
Junior High Schools			
I.S. 88	144	64.58	28.46
Hunter	95	55.78	39.99
Joan of Arc	454	53.73	32.15
Totals	693	56.28	32.61
Overall Sample	6,783	45.68	46.62

group and concern for other individuals and groups is so ancient a goal of civic education it has become hoary. The findings here suggest that any efforts toward this goal at Lane might well be directed toward increasing the group size dimension since this is the area in which Lane students seem different from students at other schools.

Table 41: High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Interpersonal Involvement I

Protagonist

School	Total Interviewed	Group Size I and He %	Group Size We and They %
Brandeis	353	40.78	49.85
Chas. E. Hughes	146	44.51	48.62
Franklin K. Lane	64	51.56	31.25
Gratz	224	43.29	34.84
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	43.63	45.45
Freeport	72	81.94	22.22
Woodlands	196	60.70	32.64
Overall sample	6,783	45.68	46.62

Educational Level Comparison

As can be seen in Table 42, the group size in the overall sample was about evenly divided between individuals (45.68%) and groups (46.62%). Of events reported as individual in the high school group, suburban Hastings described 25.82%, although urban Hunter approached Hastings at 29.51% (below the overall sample of 45.68% by 19.86% and 16.17% respectively). Suburban Woodlands (60.70%), however, was higher than the overall sample by 15.02% and suburban Freeport (81.94%) higher by 36.36%. The majority of the high schools reported percentages within a comparable proximity to the overall sample. Reported incidents with a group as protagonist ranged from 18.04% at suburban Freeport to 64.56% at suburban Hastings and 64.44% at urban Hunter. The overall sample for groups reported was 46.62%. The dispersion of reported percentages was much broader among the suburban high schools than among the urban schools. The urban schools, with the exception of Hunter, hovered more closely to the overall sample in contrast to the suburban schools as a group, where more schools reported percentages higher than the overall sample.

Our data indicate that in predominantly white schools, identification of group was described more often than the overall sample and more often than predominantly black high schools.

The junior high school range for individual as protagonist was from 53.73% at suburban Joan of Arc and 64.58% at urban I.S. 88, although suburban North Salem Middle (64.55%) was comparable to I.S. 88. The overall sample was 45.68%. In all reports from the junior high schools, the percentages were higher than the overall sample. Conversely, percentages reported for group as protagonist

Table 42: Educational Level Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement I Protagonist

High Schools	Total Interviewed	Group Size I and He %	We and They %
Urban:			
Chas. E. Hughes	146	44.51	48.62
Franklin K. Lane	64	51.56	31.24
Hunter	166	29.51	64.44
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	43.63	45.45
Brandeis	353	40.78	49.85
Gratz	224	43.29	34.84
Suburban:			
Hastings	333	25.82	64.56
New Rochelle	673	41.00	50.36
Mineola	1,311	34.77	60.32
Sleepy Hollow	376	38.03	49.72
Woodlands	196	60.70	32.64
Freeport	72	81.94	18.04
Notre Dame	210	42.84	53.80
Overall Sample	6,783	45.68	46.62
Elementary Schools			
P.S. 165	105	63.80	29.51
P.S. 179	32	75.00	21.87
Baldwin	43	62.78	37.20
Junior High Schools			
Hastings	471	54.14	43.73
Mineola	616	57.13	38.95
North Salem Middle	79	64.55	31.64
Joan of Arc	454	53.73	32.15
Hunter	95	55.78	39.99
I.S. 88	144	64.58	28.46
Overall Sample	6,783	45.68	46.62

were all less than the overall sample (46.62%). Suburban Hastings was highest (43.73%); the lowest was urban I.S. 88 (28.46%).

Suburban Baldwin (62.78%) was higher than the overall sample (45.68%) for I and He incidents by 17.10% and urban P.S. 179 (75.00%) was higher by 29.32%. Again, the difference between P.S. 179 and P.S. 165 (63.80%) is to be noted as referred to earlier in the Distance analysis. For We or They incidents, the elementary schools were lower than the overall sample (46.62%).

Significantly ($\chi^2 = 47.95$) more of the students who described their incidents in terms of a single individual, I or He, talked of conflict with peers (26.24%) than those who described a conflict in terms of a group, We or They (18.72%). The larger the protagonist group, the more mature the students' political attitudes and the more likely they were to be in conflict with authorities rather than peers.

In the overall sample significantly ($\chi^2 = 557.31$) more students who discussed their incidents in terms of I or He described a personal antagonist (64.27%) than those who described their incident in terms of We or They (37.02%). Conversely, fewer of the students who described incidents in terms of I or We described their antagonist as an institution (15.65%) than those who described their incident in terms of We or They.

Our data appear to support the hypothesis that one's social horizon enlarges with age. With increased maturity, the older adolescent is more likely to be concerned with a group rather than individuals. This development can be observed from elementary school through junior high school and high school.

Relative Status

Another test of whether one could see situations from other people's perspectives would be discussing incidents with antagonists socially distant from the writer. If the incident involved a peer as antagonist, the writer would be said to be less distant. This is the horizontal dimension in Figure 2. Peers were presumed to be less distant than adults for high school students. Therefore, if a larger percentage of high school students mentioned conflicts with adults, this would be evidence that they were involved with more distant people and thus with more diverse perspectives. This dimension of interpersonal involvement was labelled Relative Status. As can be seen in Table 43, in the overall sample most incidents described conflict with Authority (67.65%) rather than Peer (19.45%). Thus, students' concept of the democratic process involved inequities in status.

Relative Status and Personification describe the other party to the conflict. They are, in a sense, the mirror images of the Distance and Group Size dimensions of the characterization of the protagonist discussed above. Distance was the category used to describe the social distance, if any, between the writer and the protagonist of the incident, to distinguish whether the writer was personally involved or not in the incident he described. Relative Status was the category used to estimate the social distance between the protagonist and the antagonist; to distinguish whether the other party to the conflict was a peer or

someone.*

Table 43: Relative Status and Personification

Antagonist

		Percent	Number
Distance:	Peer	19.47	1,319
	Authority	67.65	4,589
	Total	87.12	5,908
Group Size:	Person	45.65	3,907
	Institution	23.45	1,591
	Total	69.10	4,688

Group Size was the name used to distinguish whether the incident was described in terms of the interests of an individual or a group protagonist. Personification was the category chosen to characterize group size and abstractness for the other party to the conflict. While almost no conflict involved impersonal collective protagonists (as might be indicated by the use of "one" rather than I, we, or they) a considerable number had impersonal antagonists as indicated by the use of such terms as "they," "the system," "the board," "the higher-ups." Groups of persons were considered intermediate in size and abstractness between individuals and institutions. Comparisons are therefore made between, on the one hand, incidents involving individual antagonists versus incidents involving either groups or institutions as antagonists and, on the other hand, incidents involving individual persons or groups as antagonists versus incidents involving institutions as antagonists.

Cross-Sectional Study of the Schools in Four Communities

As can be seen in Table 44, in the suburban schools the results on conflict with Peer were clear. At Mineola High School fewer (9.53%) Peer conflict was reported than at Mineola Junior High (32.62%). Hastings High School had significantly ($\chi^2 = 26.00$) fewer (18.91%) Peer conflict reported than Hastings Junior High (26.53%). Thus, both suburban comparisons indicate that Peer conflict was more often described in suburban junior high schools than in suburban high schools.

In the suburban schools the results on conflict with Authority were equally clear. The percentage of conflict with Authority was significantly ($\chi^2 = 120.01$) greater at Mineola High (81.69%) than at Mineola Junior High (58.27%).

---

*Peers were presumed to be less Distant than adults for high school students. Since it was possible that the other party to the conflict might be a subordinate, that choice was included in the coding. Results showed so few (under 02%) conflicts with subordinates reported by high school students that this category was dropped from the present analysis.

Similarly, at Hastings High there was significantly (^{2} = 7.45) more conflict reported with Authority (76.97%) than at Hastings Junior High (60.93%). Thus, both suburban comparisons show that conflict with Authority was more often described at high school than at junior high school level. In suburban schools, fewer conflicts were seen involving Peer and more involving Authority as school level increased from junior high to high school.

Table 44: Cross-Sectional Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement II

Antagonist

School	Total Interviewed	Relative Status Peer %	Authority %
Suburban			
Mineola H.S.	1,311	9.53	81.69
Mineola J.H.S.	616	32.62	58.27
χ^2		159.17**	120.01**
Hastings H.S.	333	18.91	76.97
Hastings J.H.S.	471	26.53	60.93
χ^2		26.00**	7.45**
Urban			
Brandeis H.S.	353	18.13	66.28
Joan of Arc	454	21.14	57.48
P.S. 165	105	49.52	41.90
χ^2		47.25*	20.88*
Hunter H.S.	166	31.92	56.02
Hunter J.H.S.	95	35.78	50.52
χ^2		.40**	.73**
Overall sample	6,783	19.47	67.65

* χ^2 value $\geq$ 7.815 required for significance

** χ^2 value $\geq$ 3.841 required for significance

In urban schools, the results were similar but less conclusive, again because of the exceptional results from Hunter Junior High and Hunter High School. At Brandeis fewer incidents were reported (18.13%) as conflict with Peer than at Joan of Arc (21.14%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, fewer incidents were reported as conflicts with Peer than at P.S. 165 (49.52%). The differences were significant (χ^2 = 47.25). At Hunter High there was less Peer conflict with Peer reported (31.92%) than at Hunter Junior High (35.78%). The difference was not significant (χ^2 = 0.40), but was in the predicted direction. At Brandeis, there was more conflict reported with Authority (66.28%) than at Joan of Arc (57.48%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, there was more reported than at P.S. 165 (41.90%). The differences were significant (χ^2 = 20.88), and in the predicted direction. In sum, at the urban schools, fewer conflicts were seen as involving peers and more as

involving authorities as school level increased. The findings for urban schools were similar to those for suburban schools in this respect.

Urban-Suburban Comparison

As can be seen in Table 45, suburban high school students reported more of their incidents as conflict with Authority (74.42%) than with Peer (14.54%). Urban high school students also reported more of their incidents as conflict with Authority (59.82%) than as conflict with Peer (21.43%). Overall, suburban high school students reported more conflict with Authority than their urban counterparts ($\chi^2 = 79.05$) while reporting less conflict with Peer ($\chi^2 = 26.75$).

Suburban junior high school students reported more of their incidents as conflicts with Authority (59.52%) than as conflicts with Peer (29.93%). Urban junior high school students also reported more of their incidents as conflicts with Authority (59.74%) than as conflicts with Peer (22.22%). Suburban and urban junior high school students reported about the same percentage of conflicts with Authority, but suburban junior high school students saw more conflict with Peer than did their urban counterparts ($\chi^2 = 13.08$).

As suburban students progressed in school they tended to report more conflict with Authority ($\chi^2 = 90.89$) and less conflict with Peer ($\chi^2 = 132.88$). As urban students progressed in school there was no significant change in the amount of conflict they reported as being with Peer or Authority.

High Schools with Black Students

As may be noted from Table 46, the overall sample of the students described their dilemmas in democracy as occurring with Peer in 19.47% of the incidents. The percentage for schools with black students was not significantly different from that of the overall sample. The range of Peer conflict at predominantly Black schools was comparable to that of predominantly white schools at the high school level. At Lane (9.37%) and William Grady Vocational (9.09%) there were over 10% less Peer conflicts reported. Authority, for the overall sample (67.65%) and for each of the schools with black students, was far more frequently mentioned as the opponent in conflict than Peer (19.47%) in the overall sample.

Educational Level Comparison

As can be noted in Table 47, in the overall sample, 19.47% students described dilemmas in democracy with Peer as antagonist and 67.65% with Authority. Percentages described as Peer conflict by high school students in general trend toward that of the overall sample, but the extreme differences in higher reporting were at two urban schools, Chas. E. Hughes (34.24%) and Hunter (31.92%). The extremes at the low level of this range were at urban Franklin K. Lane (9.37%) and suburban Mineola (9.53%). Conversely, for conflict reported with Authority figures, Mineola (81.69%) was highest, while Gratz (44.19%) was lowest. The overall sample was 67.65% and the percentages of all the high schools were in the direction of the overall sample without the wide range between individual schools that were reported for Peer conflict.

Table 45: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement II

Antagonist

	Total Interviewed	Relative Status Peer %	Authority %
Suburban Sample			
High Schools			
Mineola	1,311	9.53	81.69
New Rochelle	673	15.60	71.17
Hastings	333	18.91	70.27
Sleepy Hollow	376	21.54	61.17
Woodlands	196	18.36	67.34
Notre Dame	210	25.23	77.14
Freeport	72	26.38	72.22
Totals	3,171	14.54	74.42
Junior High Schools			
Mineola	616	32.62	58.27
Hastings	471	26.53	60.93
North Salem Middle	79	29.11	60.76
Totals	1,166	29.93	59.52
Overall Sample	6,783	19.47	67.65
Urban Sample			
High Schools			
Brandeis	353	18.13	66.28
Chas. E. Hughes	146	34.24	58.21
Gratz	224	22.76	44.19
Hunter	166	31.92	56.02
Franklin K. Lane	64	9.37	73.43
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	9.09	81.81
Totals	1,008	21.43	59.82
Junior High Schools			
I.S. 88	144	16.66	72.91
Hunter	95	35.78	50.52
Joan of Arc	454	21.14	57.48
Totals	693	22.22	59.74
Overall Sample	6,783	19.47	67.65

Table 46: High Schools with Black Students Comparison
Interpersonal Involvement II

Antagonist

School	Total Interviewed	Relative Status Peer %	Authority %
Brandeis	353	18.13	66.28
Chas. E. Hughes	146	34.24	58.21
Franklin K. Lane	64	9.37	73.43
Gratz	224	22.76	44.19
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	9.09	81.81
Freeport	72	26.38	72.22
Woodlands	196	18.36	67.34
Overall Sample	6,783	19.47	67.65

Table 47: Educational Level Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement II

Antagonist

	Total Interviewed	Relative Status	
		Peer	Authority
High Schools		%	%
Urban:			
Chas. E. Hughes	146	34.24	58.21
Franklin K. Lane	64	9.37	73.43
Hunter	166	31.92	56.02
Wm. Grady Vocational	-	-	-
Brandeis	353	18.13	66.28
Gratz	224	22.76	44.19
Suburban:			
Hastings	333	18.91	76.97
New Rochelle	673	15.60	71.17
Mineola	1,311	9.53	81.69
Sleepy Hollow	376	21.54	61.17
Woodlands	196	18.36	67.34
Freeport	72	26.38	72.22
Notre Dame	-	-	-
Overall Sample	6,783	19.47	67.65
Elementary Schools			
P.S. 165	105	49.52	41.90
Junior High Schools			
Hastings	471	26.53	60.93
Mineola	616	32.62	58.27
North Salem Middle	-	-	-
Joan of Arc	454	21.14	57.48
Hunter	95	35.78	50.52
I.S. 88	144	16.66	72.91
Overall Sample	6,783	19.47	67.65

In the junior high schools, Peer conflict was generally reported more often than in the high schools. The lowest percentage of Peer conflict was 16.66% at urban I.S. 88 and highest at urban Hunter Junior High with 35.78%, although suburban Mineola approached Hunter with 32.62%. Conflict with Authority was reported least at Hunter (50.52%) and most at I.S. 88 (72.91%). The overall sample with Authority conflict was 67.65%.

The one elementary school included in the data, P.S. 165, was almost even in reporting for Peer (49.52%) and Authority (41.90%).

Personification

It was assumed that involvement in conflicts with individual persons was less mature than involvement with larger groups. Personification is the vertical dimension in Figure 2. This was based on another of Inhelder and Piaget's assertions (1958) as expanded by Parsons and Milman (p. 348) to wit:

> . . . the child relates only to small groups and specific individuals while the adolescent relates to institutional structures and to values as such.

The proportion of incidents involving conflict with Institution could thus be seen as an index of the social maturity of the writers. In the overall sample, more incidents were reported as conflict with Person (45.65%) than as conflict with Institution (23.45%). Thus, adolescents may be moving toward an impersonal, abstract view of social conflict, but they have not attained it by the high school years.

Cross-Sectional Study of the Schools in Four Communities

As can be noted in Table 48, in the suburban schools, results were clear. Significantly ($\chi^2 = 13.90$) fewer conflicts were seen as with Person at Mineola High School (48.74%) than at Mineola Junior High (59.37%). Significantly ($\chi^2 = 12.46$) fewer conflicts were seen as with Person at Hastings High School (31.83%) than at Hastings Junior High (44.16%). In sum, conflict with Person was more frequent at suburban junior high schools than at suburban high schools.

In the urban schools, results were also clear and paralleled those in the suburban schools. At Brandeis there were fewer incidents reported as conflict with Person (29.74%) than at Joan of Arc (60.13%); at Joan of Arc, in turn, fewer incidents were reported as conflict with Person than at P.S. 165 (78.09%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 109.66$). There was no significant difference between Hunter High School and Hunter Junior High in percentage of conflict reported with Person. In sum, all significant differences showed more conflict reported with Person in urban junior high than in urban high schools.

The results on conflict reported with Institution, as opposed to Person or Group, were unequivocal in the suburban schools. At Mineola High School, significantly ($\chi^2 = 57.09$) more incidents were reported as conflict with Institution (28.45%) than at Mineola Junior High (12.82%). Similarly, at Hastings High School significantly ($\chi^2 = 15.23$) more incidents were reported as conflict with Institution (33.03%) than at Hastings Junior High (20.80%). Thus conflict with Institution was more frequently reported at suburban junior high than at suburban high schools.

Table 48: Cross-Sectional Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement II

Antagonist

School	Total Interviewed	Personification	
		Person %	Institution %
Suburban			
Mineola H.S.	1,311	48.74	28.45
Mineola J.H.S.	616	59.37	12.82
χ^2		13.90**	57.09**
Hastings H.S.	333	31.83	33.03
Hastings J.H.S.	471	44.16	20.80
χ^2		12.46**	15.23**
Urban			
Brandeis	353	29.74	28.99
Joan of Arc	454	60.13	10.79
P.S. 165	105	78.09	3.80
χ^2		109.66*	61.04*
Hunter H.S.	166	23.49	31.92
Hunter J.H.S.	95	22.10	14.73
χ^2		.07**	9.37**
Overall sample	6,783	45.65	23.45

* χ^2 value $\geq$ 7.815 required for significance

** χ^2 value $\geq$ 3.841 required for significance

In the urban schools, results were clear and again paralleled those found in the suburban schools. At Brandeis more incidents were reported as involving conflict with Institution (28.99%) than at Joan of Arc (10.79%) than at P.S. 165 (3.80%). The differences were significant ($\chi^2 = 61.14$). At Hunter High School significantly ($\chi^2 = 9.37$) more incidents were reported as conflict with Authority (31.92%) than at Hunter Junior High (14.73%). In sum, more conflicts were reported as conflict with the Institution in high schools than in Junior high schools, both urban and suburban.

Urban-Suburban Comparison

As Table 49 shows, suburban high school students reported more of their incidents as conflict with Person (41.72%) than as conflict with Institution (29.71%). Urban high school students also reported more of their incidents as conflict with Person (32.34%) than as conflict with Institution (25.79%). Overall suburban high school students reported more conflict with Person than did their urban counterparts ($\chi^2 = 28.17$); however, there was no significant difference between urban and suburban high school students in the amount of conflict with Institution that they reported ($\chi^2 = 5.71$).

Table 49: Urban-Suburban Comparison of Interpersonal Involvement II

Antagonist

	Total Interviewed	Personification	
		Person	Institution
		%	%
Suburban Sample			
High Schools			
Mineola	1,311	48.74	28.45
New Rochelle	673	30.31	36.55
Hastings	333	31.83	33.03
Sleepy Hollow	376	32.97	29.78
Woodlands	196	46.42	23.97
Notre Dame	210	50.47	23.33
Freeport	72	73.61	6.94
Totals	3,171	41.72	29.71
Junior High Schools			
Mineola	616	59.57	12.82
Hastings	471	44.16	20.80
North Salem Middle	79	54.43	12.66
Totals	1,166	53.00	16.04
Overall Sample	6,783	45.65	23.45
Urban Sample			
High Schools			
Brandeis	353	29.74	28.89
Chas. E. Hughes	146	34.24	25.34
Gratz	224	33.03	17.41
Hunter	166	23.49	31.92
Franklin K. Lane	64	48.43	18.75
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	49.09	30.90
Totals	1,008	32.34	25.79
Junior High Schools			
I.S. 88	144	77.08	6.25
Hunter	95	22.10	14.73
Joan of Arc	454	60.13	10.79
Totals	693	58.44	10.39
Overall Sample	6,783	45.65	23.45

Suburban junior high school students reported more of their incidents as being conflict with Person (53.00%) than as conflict with Institution (16.04%). Urban junior high school students also reported more of their incidents as conflict with Person (58.44%) than as conflict with Institution (10.39%). Overall, there was no significant difference ($\chi^2 = 5.20$) between urban and suburban junior high school students in the amount of conflict that they reported as being with Person; however, suburban junior high school students reported more conflict with Institution than did their urban counterparts ($\chi^2 = 11.58$).

As suburban students progressed in school they tended to report more incidents as being conflict with Institution ($\chi^2 = 82.79$) and less incidents as being conflict with Person ($\chi^2 = 43.87$). Similarly, as urban students progressed in school they tended to report more of their incidents as being conflict with Institution ($\chi^2 = 62.07$) and less as being conflict with Person ($\chi^2 = 114.14$).

High Schools with Black Students

Table 50: High Schools with Black Students Comparison: Interpersonal Involvement II

School	Total Interviewed	Antagonist: Personification Person %	Antagonist: Personification Institutions %
Brandeis	353	29.74	28.89
Chas. E. Hughes	146	34.24	25.34
Franklin K. Lane	64	48.43	18.75
Gratz	224	33.03	17.41
Wm. Grady Vocational	55	49.09	30.90
Freeport	72	73.61	6.94
Woodlands	196	46.42	23.97
Overall sample	6,783	45.65	23.45

In the overall sample, as can be noted in Table 50, more conflict was reported as seen with Person (45.65%) than with Institution (23.45%). Conflict with Person was reported more often than conflict with Institution in every one of the schools in the sample having black students also. The range for Person conflict was from Brandeis (29.74%) to Freeport (73.61%). The reported percentages for Institution conflict were comparable to the overall sample (23.45%) with the exception of Grady (30.90%) and Freeport (6.94%). In all cases, the percentages reported for Person relate very definitely to Authority figures in contrast to those reported for Peer figures. The one exception was that of Chas. E. Hughes where Person (34.24%) was identical to Peer (34.24%), but Authority was still higher with 58.21%. Reports of violence at some of these schools between students may be due to the circumstance that it is difficult to get at the person in authority and easy to vent the anger upon peers. The release of hostile feelings on peers that has made news headlines does not seem to lead the students to express the conflict as primarily a peer-peer one.

Educational Level Comparison

As can be seen in Table 51, in the overall sample, conflict with Person was reported 45.65% in contrast to Institution (23.45%). In the high schools Person was reported fairly comparable in both urban and suburban schools to the overall sample with the exception of Freeport (73.61%). The range in the high schools, with the exception of Freeport, was Hunter (23.49%) to Mineola (48.74%). Conflict with Institution was comparable to, but slightly higher than the overall sample (23.45%) with the exception of Gratz (17.41%) and Lane (18.75%). The one school completely out of this pattern was Freeport (6.94%). Conflict with Person was reported less often in the high schools than in the junior highs; conflict with Institution was generally more in high schools than in junior highs.

Junior high school students described conflict with Person more often than the overall sample (45.65%) with the exception of Hunter Junior High (22.10%) and Hastings (44.16%). The extreme limits from the overall sample are at Hunter (23.55% lower than the overall sample) and 77.08% at I.S. 88 (31.33% higher than the overall sample). In all cases of conflict with Institution, the junior high schools were lower than the overall sample (23.45%); the range being from 20.80% at Hastings to 6.25% at I.S. 88. Again, the differences were between schools, not locale.

The one elementary school for which there was data, P.S. 165, reported 78.09% for Person and 3.80% for Institution.

Conflict with Person was described generally less often at predominantly White high schools than at predominantly Black high schools. Conflict with Institution was slightly more often described at predominantly white high schools than in the predominantly black high schools.

Conclusions

A fuller discussion of the conclusions of this study with regard to their implications for teaching can be found in the Manual of Objectives and Guidelines for High School Civic Education. In the present section, attention will be limited to the conclusions about the specific hypotheses on Decentering that were originally derived from Inhelder and Piaget. The major concept, Decentering, was separated into two sub-categories: differentiating one's own from others' viewpoints, and the enlargement of one's social horizon.

The achievement of a wide variety of points of view was defined as Distance; the widening of one's social horizons as Group Size.

Each of these aspects of Decentering was investigated twice: once from the evidence provided by the description of the protagonist and again from the description of the antagonist of the dilemma incidents. The incidents were the ones students described in response to our questionnaire.

Distance: With regard to the protagonist, Distance was defined as describing the protagonist as I or We versus He or They. The hypothesis was that the older the students, the more likely they were to describe incidents in terms of the Distant He or They. It was found that the higher the school level, the more frequently students described incidents involving others rather than themselves.

Table 51: Educational Level Comparison: Interpersonal Involvement II

	Total Interviewed	Antagonist: Personification — Person %	Antagonist: Personification — Institution %
High Schools			
Urban:			
Chas. E. Hughes	146	34.24	25.34
Franklin K. Lane	64	48.43	18.75
Hunter	166	23.49	31.92
Wm. Grady Vocational	-	-	-
Brandeis	353	29.74	28.89
Gratz	224	33.03	17.41
Suburban:			
Hastings	333	31.83	33.03
New Rochelle	673	30.31	36.55
Mineola	1,311	48.74	28.45
Sleepy Hollow	376	32.97	29.78
Woodlands	196	46.42	23.97
Freeport	72	73.61	6.94
Notre Dame	-	-	-
Overall Sample	6,783	45.65	23.45
Elementary Schools			
P.S. 165	105	78.09	3.80
Junior High Schools			
Hastings	471	44.16	20.80
Mineola	616	59.57	12.82
North Salem Middle	-	-	-
Joan of Arc	454	60.13	10.79
Hunter	95	22.10	14.73
I.S. 88	144	77.08	6.25
Overall Sample	6,783	45.65	23.45

The results were the same when comparing schools in the Cross-Sectional study as when comparing students in the Urban-Suburban study. Thus, the hypothesis with regard to Distance was confirmed. At the same time, the overall sample showed that most students described incidents in which they were personally involved. The succession of stages is not an abrupt transition in the sense that all less mature behavior is eliminated when the more mature behavior appears.

Since personal involvement as indicated by use of I or We in describing an incident was more characteristic of younger students and since more students who described Distant protagonists (He or They) also described conflict with institutions rather than persons, the hypothesis that more mature students are more likely to see their conflicts as with abstract institutions is supported.

Group Size: With regard to the protagonist, Group Size was defined as describing the incident in terms of I or He versus We or They. The hypothesis was that the older the students, the more likely they were to describe incidents in terms of the group We or They. It was found that the higher the school level, the more frequently students described incidents in Group rather than Individuals as protagonists. This was true for both the comparison by schools in the Cross-Sectional study and the comparison by students in the Urban-Suburban study. Thus, the hypothesis with regard to Group Size was confirmed. Again, as in the study of Distance, the overall results showed that the less mature tendency was not supplanted but supplemented by the more mature.

Students at higher levels of school were more likely to describe incidents involving others and more likely to describe incidents involving large groups. At higher levels of school, therefore, students can be expected to become more interested in the concerns of others. At lower levels, the findings on Distance and Group Size suggest that the curriculum will be more in keeping with the interests of students if it focusses on the immediately present and on the individual. One should not overlook, however, the fact that a sizeable proportion of the concerns of even the high school student are personal and individual. Curriculum planning may well take this into account by allotting some time to issues arising within the classroom and to individual concerns as part of the civic education of students.

Since large Group Size was another correlate of greater maturity, the finding that those who described a larger group size were also more likely to discuss their conflict as with an Institution supports the hypothesis that more mature students are more likely to perceive their conflict as with an Institution. Similarly, since more mature students described Group rather than Individual protagonists and more of those who described Group protagonists also described less Peer conflict, the hypothesis that the more mature the students the more likely their conflicts are to be against Authorities. This hypothesis and the Erickson-Havighurst idea that the older high school student is more likely to be involved with finding his place in the adult world, and therefore more likely to be in conflict with Authorities than the younger student was confirmed in the present study.

Relative Status: With regard to the antagonist described in the incident, the indicator that one could differentiate one's own from others' viewpoints was the difference between the status of the protagonist and the antagonist in the incident described. It was assumed that more frequent mention of those of different status would indicate some awareness of other more Distant points of view.

The hypothesis with regard to Relative Status was that the older the students the more likely they were to describe antagonists who represented Authority rather than Peer. It was found that the higher the school level, the more frequently students described incidents involving conflict with Authority rather than Peer. This was true for all but one of the comparisons by school in the Cross-Sectional comparison and was true for students in the suburban sample. It was not found in the urban sample as a whole. Thus, the hypothesis with regard to Relative Status was only partially confirmed. Once more, the more mature stage supplemented, but did not supplant the less mature.

Personification: The enlargement of one's social horizon was represented, in the description of the antagonist in the incident, by Personification. Personification was indicated by describing an Individual versus an Institution as the antagonist of the incident. With regard to Personification, the hypothesis was that the older the students, the more likely they were to describe incidents with an abstracted group (or Institution) as the antagonist. It was found that the higher the school level, the more frequently incidents were described as with Institutions as antagonists. This was true both for the Cross-Sectional comparison by schools and the Urban-Suburban comparison by students. Thus, the hypothesis with regard to Personification was fully confirmed. The supplementing rather than replacing function of the more mature mode of thinking was true for this comparison as well as the earlier ones.

The Relative Status and Personification comparisons led to the conclusion that with increasing school level, the antagonists in conflict were more often perceived as Authorities and as Institutions. Distance, as indicated by relative status of the antagonist, increased with school as did Distance as indicated by self-involvement of the protagonist. Group Size, as indicated by Personification of the antagonist, increased with school level, as did Group Size as indicated by size of the group described as protagonist. In general, both Distance and Group Size increase with school level. Piaget's conception of the adolescent as increasingly concerned with larger and more distant groups seems confirmed by our data.

Distance, Group Size, Relative Status and Personification were selected for the present study as indicators of the Piagetian concept of Decentering. The intentionality of moral judgments had been shown by previous investigators to develop with age. The present study did not investigate intentionality. It extended the concept of moral development in terms of those with whom the individual felt concern. It showed that as adolescents grow older, they are more concerned with people other than themselves and with larger groups. It also showed that as they grow older, adolescents are more likely to be concerned with conflicts with those who are more distant from them in status and with larger more abstract groups. Thus, every one of our indicators of Decentering produced data which supports the Piagetian hypothesis that Decentering is recapitulated in adolescence and for the basic Piagetian concept of Decentering.

Bibliography

1. Inhelder, Barbel and Jean Piaget. The Growth of Logical Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

2. Kohlberg, Lawrence. Development of moral character and moral ideology. In: Hoffman, Martin L. and Lois Hoffman, Review of Child Development Research. New York: Russell Sage, 1964.

3. Turiel, Elliot. An experimental analysis of development stages in the child's moral judgment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yale University, 1964.

Chapter VIII

PROJECT FILMS

James Mandel

The project films produced fall into three categories: (1) the filming of a social studies class to record student and teacher behavior in a typical classroom situation; (2) the filming of staged incidents to illustrate the participation codes and the dilemmas they present, and (3) a documentary film of student protest in New York City which also, to a great extent, illustrates the civic participation codes.

1. A Social Studies Class at Hastings High School
filmed by John Swayze, January 1969. (20 minutes)

This film was undertaken to record in a natural climate the behavioral patterns of students and the teacher during a class period. Originally it was hoped that this would aid in developing an observation method that would be suitable for helping to define objectives of democratic behavior. In this regard, the film proved to be unfruitful; however, this seeming failure did contribute to the realization that the development of strictly behavioral objectives for civic education was not a promising enterprise.

2. We developed four categories of democratic participation--dissent, equality, due process, and decision-making--which we believe describe most of the major conflicts faced by students that would be relevant for a new civic education. To show how such issues arise, the dilemmas they present, and the ambiguity surrounding them, the project staff wrote and commissioned the filming of two dramatizations to illustrate problems of dissent and equality, two of the four participation categories.

(a) Dissent (15 minutes): In this film a student unsuccessfully tries to read an article from an underground student newspaper that protests the lengthening of the school day to make up for time lost during the teachers' strike. An offensive word in the article's title arouses protest from the student's classmates and when the student persists in reading the article, the teacher takes the paper away. At this point, the issue raised is whether a student has the right to express certain views or use certain words when a majority of his audience does not want to hear them. The film proceeds to explore some of the possible repercussions such an incident might have and the various unseen pressures inherent in conflict situations.

The dissenting student's parents are shown expressing concern that their son not suffer any penalties until he has had a fair hearing. On the other hand, the mother of a classmate of the dissenting student wants assurances from the principal that her daughter's education will not be disrupted by the daughter's overreacting to what she perceives as shocking misbehavior. The principal, afraid that the mother's concern will rouse community indignation, tries to put pressure on the teacher to keep her class under control. The teacher, who has a union behind her, wants the principal to take the unruly student out of her class.

The film was used with some success in stimulating students to write incidents of dilemmas in democracy on which the project based its findings. Unfortunately, the showing of the film took up some of the time students felt they needed for writing and was discontinued for that reason.

(b) Equality (10 minutes): This film concerns the administering of a test to determine the assignment of sixth grade pupils to special junior high schools. All students take the test although for some of them, because of their good records, the test is superfluous. In the film a young white girl who does not have to take the test is sitting next to a black student who must do well on the test if he is to get into the special junior high school. In the course of the examination the girl switches papers with the black student who is obviously having difficulty. This entire sequence is shown twice. In the first instance, the teacher sees it but decides to take no action; in the second sequence, the teacher insists that the students give the exchanged papers back so that each has his original test paper.

The problem raised in this case is that of the teacher's: What should he do when he believes that a test is unfair to certain students because of their background and that the test will deprive them of valuable educational experience? Should the teacher remain indifferent to cheating by the students when he feels that to do otherwise would be assisting the school's cheating of certain students?

3. Ira, You'll Get in Trouble (1970)
Produced by Steve Sbarge. (1 hour 45 minutes)

The New York City High School Student Union is the focus of this situation during the 1968-69 school year. Originally, the students came together in an attempt to reopen schools that were closed by a teachers' strike over the issue of decentralization of the New York City public schools. The title is taken from a warning given by a parent to her son as he sets off to distribute the High School Free Press, an underground student paper that came into existence at this time. The High School Student Union represents an attempt to muster the same kind of organizational power gained by the teachers through unionization. What the students in the Student Union seek is a voice in a school system which they believe is insensitive to their needs and desires. As the film shows, however, not all students share this view. In addition to decision-making, the Student Union also raises issue of due process, the right to dissent and equality. The film provides perhaps the best and most stimulating illustration of a particular point of view on the Center's participation categories. In fact, the filming, which was done independently of the Center, helps confirm the relevance of the Center's four participation categories.

4. Film Clips.

One insight provided by the film is that incidents rarely partake of just one category, but often involve two or more of them. In spite of this, an attempt was made to take four clips from the film (approximately 3-5 minutes in length) to illustrate each of the Center's participation categories.

(a) Decision-making: The scene is that of a demonstration at John Bowne High School in Queens. The clip shows the leaders of the demonstration handing out leaflets at the beginning of the day to get others involved, addressing the

students about their grievances, and, finally, the leaders sheepishly leaving the school grounds when threatened with arrest. The immediate cause of the demonstration was the suspension of a student. The demand of the student leaders was an end to suspension as a form of punishment. The basic issue raised in the film is whether demonstrations and disruptions of school routine are legitimate ways for students to seek a voice in setting school policy. Are there any alternatives that now exist or could be put into operation to give students a voice in school affairs?

(b) Dissent: This clip shows a meeting between representatives of various student groups and Milton Galamison, vice-president of the New York City Board of Education. The students are at the meeting to protest suspensions and other penalties given to colleagues and themselves for distributing leaflets and protesting school policies. Most of these acts of dissent, according to the students, took place off the school property, although nearby. The issue is summed up by a question asked by one of the students: "When do school regulations take precedence over national law, i.e., constitutional protection of free speech and free press?"

(c) Due Process: A meeting between one of the leaders of the High School Student Union and an attorney from the New York Emergency Civil Liberties Committee provides the setting for this clip. At the meeting they are trying to map a strategy for legally testing whether students have the right to distribute leaflets in school. One question raised is whether awaiting court decisions is a meaningful way to establish a right for a student who will leave school long before the decision is made.

In the previously mentioned clips, due process was also an issue. In those clips the students discussed the procedural rights available to students being suspended or transferred and the ways in which the school administrations tried to evade according those rights.

(d) Equality: This clip opens with a concluding section from a Black Panther film and continues with a student discussion of that film. Some of the students suggest that racial tension in the high school is a fiction invented by the school administration and that in fact Black Panthers and students are fighting for the same thing. Thus, the equality issue raised in the film is not that of racial equality but of giving students equal status with their teachers and school administrators. The extent to which students feel they are unjustifiably being deprived of their dignity as human beings is clearly expressed.

It should be mentioned that in these clips and the documentary film the students raise questions based on what they believe the American system stands for: freedom, democracy and equality. Very little that they say derives from what could be called "alien ideologies." Thus, the use of what the project had identified as the four basic categories of American political experience should be intelligible to all sides in the controversies that rage within and about our schools.

Chapter IX

MANUAL OF OBJECTIVES AND GUIDELINES FOR HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

Frank Summers

Introduction

This manual consists of objectives and guidelines for high school civic education in the 1970's. These objectives and guidelines grow organically from an intensive research project in which more than 6,700 junior and senior high school students were asked to describe an incident of their experience in which the person involved "had difficulty deciding the democratic thing to do." Such an event is referred to as a "dilemma" incident.

To collect this large data base a team of forty researchers was organized and trained to distribute and explain the questionnaire. The researchers gathered the vast majority of the data from fifteen senior and five junior high schools, and a smattering of responses from other organizations of high school age youngsters and five elementary schools. Schools of a wide variety of socio-economic description were surveyed, from upper middle-class suburban predominantly white schools to lower class urban predominantly black and Hispanic schools.

The protocols written in response to the request for a "democratic dilemma," were coded according to four dimensions of "civic-mindedness." By this term is meant the types of issues and concerns which make up an individual's civic interests, as well as the elements perceived as bearing on those interests. The process codes showed how the conflict situation was perceived. The content codes indicated the substance of the incident with which students were concerned. The conflict resolution codes identified the types of resolution processes employed. Finally, the affect codes served to indicate the student's feelings about the outcome of his incident. The coding and interpretation of the protocols are the basis for the objectives and guidelines contained in this manual.

The complete research project has given rise to four documents which make up the citizenship education project. Included in the project are a comprehensive report of the research methodology and a detailed discussion of the findings: an analysis of civic participation entitled "Civic Participation in a Crisis Age," and a position paper on civic education entitled "Civic Education in the Reform Era: A Position Paper for the Seventies."

Both the objectives and guidelines are based on the following definitions of democracy and participation.

Democracy means "of the people." A democratic government is one in which there is no distinction between subject and governor. The people may allow legislators or executors to realize the popular will, but their function is to carry out the wishes of the governors.

A democratic principle is a rule of conduct which follows from the identification of citizen and governor. For example, as governors, the people

cannot be denied certain basic rights. It would be absurd to deny a governor the right to dissent, or discuss any issue he sees fit. It is as governors that people are guaranteed the freedoms of the Bill of Rights.

Participation means "to partake of." As applied to the polity, participation is taking part in the political process. If the essential element of democracy is the equation of people and governors, it is clear that a democratic citizenry is a participative citizenry. Participation is the very essence of democracy.

The citizenship objectives are intended to aid each citizen in the fulfillment of his role as governor, i.e., as citizen.

This view of citizenship has radical implications for some common conceptions of civic education and the school. The old view of civic education as a means of socializing young citizens to an acceptance of culturally-approved values and norms is not helpful for the development of participative citizens. Furthermore, civics is not to be identified with any particular body of knowledge; it involves action to realize democratic goals. Therefore, the essence of civic education must be instruction in how to function as a democratic decision-maker. To be sure, effective decision-making requires a firm grasp of the facts and principles which are relevant to the decision, but this knowledge is a tool of effective civic action, rather than an end in itself. Consequently, civic education can be separated neither from student participation in school governance, nor from his involvement in community affairs. As a citizen, the student must learn to become an effective democratic actor in his school and community.

This view implies a conception of the school which is fundamentally opposed to the traditional one in two crucial ways. First, the school is seen as a pluralistic institution. All decisions are not made by the administration to be carried out by the teachers and students. Each of these groups has vital interests in the decisions made in the school; consequently, each must have a meaningful voice in the making of those decisions. Secondly, the school is seen as an integral element of the community which it services. Rather than a building in which the student lives an isolated part of his life, the school is seen as one aspect of community life. As such, the school is not to have sharply defined boundaries between itself and its community. As the educative aspect of its community, the school has the task of helping its students to operate effectively in the civic affairs of their community.

Each objective and guideline will be presented according to the following outline:

(a) A terse statement of the objective or guideline.

(b) An explanation and elaboration of the basic idea of (a), including the values implied by the terse statement.

(c) The basis for the objective or guideline in the research.

(d) Example(s) of typical protocol(s) illustrating either failure in meeting the objective, including an analysis of why and where the exemplary protocols are considered to be lacking; or, a developmental difference, including an analysis of this difference.

(e) An example of a rare protocol which is considered to have successfully met the objective, including a discussion of why it is so considered.

Objective One

(a) THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATES IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES OF HIS SOCIETY.

(b) As the participation of citizens in the life-blood of their society is the vital element of democracy, it follows that a democratic citizenry is one which not only participates in societal affairs, but also knows how to operate in the society so that it can be effective in its participation. As participation has been defined, it involves the governing of the society itself. Therefore, effective participation is tantamount to effective government.

(c) The data show that, in fact, high school students rarely participate in the resolution of conflicts to which they are parties. In less than one-fifth of the reported incidents did the student report having any say in the resolution of his problem. Furthermore, almost one-half of the protocols reported only one person as taking part in the conflict resolution. Many were left unresolved at the time of the writing of the incident. Furthermore, the "conflict resolution" codes demonstrate that the most favored means of conflict resolution is unilateral decision-making. Resolution processes which would involve student participation are ignored in the vast majority of cases.

Moreover, the study shows that students do not feel they are being effective in obtaining desirable outcomes. Most incidents were categorized as having "bad" outcomes from the student's point of view, and as having raised the level of tension of the conflict. It is safe to conclude that students do not feel they are being effective in achieving favorable resolutions of their conflicts. This situation does not bode well for the realization of a participative citizenry.

(d) The lack of student participation in student affairs is exemplified by these protocols:

> The G.O. President is traditionally elected from the upcoming senior class. There have been four nominees, and the student who gets the most votes is President, next highest is vice-president, and on down to secretary and treasurer. However, this year in the constitutional convention, the method of electing a G.O. president is being changed: each candidate runs with 3 other people for the 3 other offices. The only undemocratic thing about this is that the rest of the student body has little voice in making rules for the new constitution.
>
> The other part of the problem is that candidates must have a C+ (or something) average. I don't think this should be a qualification, especially if someone's average is being pulled down by physical education. There is a group of seniors and faculty members who pick the nominees (usually students who bring them flowers and apples, or their best friends). I think the students should be nominated by the student body and then the 4 who receive the highest votes go up for election.

* * *

This incident is between the Senior Councils and the students. This was the argument. The Council member suggested that the senior trip be taken on the bus. The students wanted to go on a boat ride. This wasn't fair toward the students because this was their senior trip, and they should have something to say about it and where they should go. The Senior Council members decided where they should go, that was final. The Seniors have to go along with them if they like it or not. This wasn't fair to the students.

These complaints are common. They point out the lack of opportunity students have to participate in the resolution of their own problems. But the students' feeling of powerlessness goes beyond lack of participation to the conviction that nothing can be done to rectify what may be considered to be an unfair situation.

There is a problem in my electronics class in which the teacher uses a point system for grading. The idea is that each student is required to have at least 200 points by the end of the school year. Each student receives a point each day he is present in class. In this manner the student would receive a total of 184 pt. just for being present in class every school day. The work done in class constitutes no points. The remaining 16 points needed to pass the course can only be obtained by building electronic projects, of which the material needed is not supplied by the school. A person may top the course and have all his work done with an A, he may fail purely on account of absenteeism. Projects cost money for the material the school does not supply. Each project gives a maximum of 5 pt... The students of his classes have gotten together to fight this system of grading. The teacher refuses to change or even talk to the principal.

* * *

A portion of the students would like to have a voice in the Parent-Teachers Association. They would like to have a voice in what laws should be made and how they should be enforced. This opportunity came a few weeks ago. A student panel was selected from the body to speak on the current issues concerning the students and the school. A few of the issues raised included cutting classes, after school activities, various courses and smoking.

The students feel they should have more voice in making and enforcing laws. The session ended by 1 student saying that the students were not going to discuss anything else with the parents until the parents were ready to listen.

I think the parents could have listened more to what the students have to say than arguing with them.

The overall feeling of the students these examples typify is one of resignation. There is a distinct lack of belief in the democratic process. At times this feeling can lead to despair:

> In this school many students are starting to feel that what's going on in the school is unfair, such as detention, suspension, the smoking rules, dress code, and many other school policies, personally I don't give a damn. I hate school very much and I am waiting patiently until the day I get out... Starting something such as sending a paper to all students saying strike for what they want is bullshit, because even if everyone felt that way nothing would ever become of anything...

Collectively, these students complain of the lack of democratic practices in the school. They have no faith that democratic decision-making will succeed in changing what they consider to be unfair situations. Here we see what is perhaps the major failure of civic education pointed up by our study: students not only do not effect democratic participation, but also they have no faith that it will do any good. Knowledge of democratic theory is not of concern to the vast majority of high school students. They do demonstrate a lack of ability to deal with democratic problems, and they do complain of the lack of democratic realities in their lives. What this means for education is that no traditional type of course content or curriculum material can meet the need for a new civic education. Only a change from the unilateral, monolithic school practices to a truly participative system of decision-making within the school will allow for the development of a participative citizenry, endowed with both the skill of democratic decision-making and the consequent faith that it can be successful.

This viewpoint is summarized quite well by one student:

> Well the way I feel about school student government is a feeling each student has. We are supposed to be taught how our democracy works but we're never taught how to <u>work</u> in our society. Because in our own school we don't have any say in what goes on. Such as: the way students should dress in school. How can we get clubs and student involvement in clubs. Because education does not stop at 3:00. How can we deal with racial problems in a way which can benefit us by learning how to deal with people instead of the principal closing the school to dodge the issue. Or a teacher throwing a student out of class because he is too objective and asks too many questions. These are problems which can be handled by student government which can be responsible if given a chance. The students in high school are the ones who will be the moving force of tomorrow.

(e) While there were no examples in our 6,700 protocols of problems which were resolved by large scale participation, the following protocol serves as an example of a decision which was reached in a participative manner:

> It is the custom in a high school for the senior term president and vice-president to lead the term in the traditional Senior Sing. The Sing Committee chairman had spoken with the officers before about the possibility that they could lead the sing instead of the officers. When the officers said they would resign, it was decided that they would never bring the subject up again. However, at a rehearsal a few months later, a motion was made that the Sing Chairman lead the sing instead of the two officers. The treasurer of the term immediately took charge of the meeting. She said there would be no discussion on the matter, yet immediately went

into a personal attack on the two officers saying that they didn't do any work at all so why should they have the honor of leading the sing. A vote was taken and the motion was passed.

The incident raised many problems and questions. First of all, a promise was broken when the matter was taken up. The two co-chairmen and the treasurer acted in collusion in an attempt to gain control for themselves. The question of who should lead the sing could have been brought to the term and discussed openly... The manner in which the question was handled was definitely undemocratic yet it shocked me at that time that none of the students in the group moved to stop what was happening.

A term meeting was called for the following day. The President and Vice-President put themselves up for a vote of confidence. The term voted confidence in the officers by an overwhelming margin. The term then voted on who should lead the sing. The officers then were still voted to lead the sing.

The problems could have been handled in a manner other than the democratic way. The officers could have used the vast power that they possessed to decree that they would lead the sing with no questions asked.

While this incident is not to be mistaken for a model of democratic decision-making, it does show two people willing to give up power and status if the majority so desired. The fact that these two girls both saw and acted upon the possibility of participation by all the girls of the term is evidence of a democratic thinking process, and this is not easily found among high school students. It is this type of decision-making which many students want to be involved in, and perhaps if they were, we would find more evidence of a citizenry emerging from the schools with the willingness and skill to be participants in their society.

Objective Two

(a) THE CITIZEN MAKES USE OF ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION. IF HE FINDS NO VIABLE OPTIONS OPEN, HE CREATES NEW ALTERNATIVES FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION.

(b) Two situations must obtain for the objective to be met: (1) Options must exist, or be created, and (2) Citizens must perceive them as such and act upon them.

When a citizen is dissatisfied due to a sense of injustice that his needs are not being met, a democracy must allow him modes of action to attempt to win his goal, although a possible result is the recognition that his claim was not well-founded. A citizenry which sees no means of redressing its grievances cannot partake in democratic action and, therefore, cannot participate effectively in its own society. That is why the existence and use of meaningful alternatives for action is absolutely fundamental to a democratic society. But the responsibility of the citizen goes further. A citizen committed to the democratic concept who finds no viable channels for action open to him will attempt to create new options. In this way the citizenry extends the means of participation of the society, illustrating the vital link between progress and democracy.

(c) Almost three-quarters of all protocols expressed no alternative to the course of action taken. The quasi-longitudinal study showed no significant differences between junior and senior high, or between urban and suburban settings. The data show clearly that across a wide range of schools students are not seeing alternatives on which to act. This may be due either to the absence of alternatives, or to the inability of students to perceive those that are available. However, even if the former is the case, students show little evidence of attempting to create new courses of action. In either case, the data show that civic education is not developing citizens who see and use democratic processes to obtain what they feel they have a right to.

(d) The following protocol illustrates the feeling of lack of opportunity for action:

> A few months ago I was suspended from classes because of my dress. Shit. I really can't see how dress has any connection with education. Blue jeans, bare-footed, and tee shirts will not reck my study habits. It's such a hassel to come well-groomed to school. Also my hair was quite long and I was forced to get a trim. Wow like who the hell do they think they are. Your dress and your length of your hair have no connection with the individual's education.

This student does not mention any way he could have acted to have his case reviewed or the rule changed. The only point of view expressed is one of rage at being compelled to do something he neither wishes nor sees a need to do.

(e) Compare the above response with the following one:

> This year students took matters into their own hands and started a movement to totally ignore the "existing" dress code. Girls wore pants to school, boys wore their hair at lengths which they liked and some (those who could) wore beards and moustaches. The general trend was towards much more casual dress creating a more relaxed atmosphere. When the "authorities" realized what was happening they started taking measures to curb the movement by prohibiting certain "un-school like" dress modes. This created a feeling of dissent among the students and a more intense fight against the dress code. With some research it was discovered that legally school authorities can not punish students for the clothes they wear. In fact they cannot restrict dress unless it becomes physically detrimental to the student's education. When this was discovered authorities were forced to give up their dress code which was illegal in its existing form.

Several points are evident here. First, the writer shows that the students saw an alternative to compliance by disobeying the code. This is the type of option commonly seen by those students who resort to protest to realize their goals. As they see no viable course of action within existing channels, they go outside those channels. But the protocol also demonstrates that the students saw an alternative when the protest did not work: they found the state law was on their side. As the incidents occurred in the same state, the law is as much on their side as it is on the side of the boy who wrote the previous protocol. The difference is that the latter did not actively seek means of redress and so did not find any. Furthermore, the first protocol shows no evidence that the

writer is aware that others may share his dilemma or of the potential power of this fact for group action. The second protocol demonstrates recognition of the group as a factor in democratic action.

To show evidence of having met this objective a student would have to indicate that he attempted to resolve his problem via some means which does not interfere with the rights of others. As we shall see,* negotiation, mediation, and arbitration are the preferred modes of conflict resolution in a democracy. But if these processes are not feasible, attempts at petition, picketing, strikes, assemblies, and civic disobedience show the ability to use democratic means for redress of grievance, and this is an essential component of a democrat. A student who can only complain and makes no attempt at change evidences a failure in civic education because he is not a democratic actor.

Objective Three

(a) THE CITIZEN ANALYZES COURSES OF ACTION FOR THEIR DEMOCRATIC BASES, FEASIBILITY, AND ANTICIPATED AND ACTUAL CONSEQUENCES.

(b) The perception and utilization of options is not sufficient for wholly rational democratic decisions. The fact that one sees several alternative modes of action does not guarantee that he will choose the most appropriate option. Between the perception of various ways of resolving a problem and action on one of them, there should be a process of analysis and careful consideration of each option.

This process is divided into three inquiries. First, one must ask: What is the democratic basis for each alternative? This inquiry includes such questions as, Which of the options does the citizen have a right to exercise? And: Is he obligated to attempt any particular course of action? Second, the careful democratic actor will inquire into the feasibility of each option. Each alternative will be considered for the possibilities of carrying it out, given the resources of the individuals involved. Consideration will also be given to whether he is willing to pay the price of attempting a particular option. Finally, the prospective participant must consider the anticipated (and actual) consequences of each type of action. This is difficult to do, but must be attempted because every political act occurs in a body politic composed of other citizens who will react to it. Only after considering such reactions can a citizen decide beforehand whether the pursuit of a particular course of action is worthwhile.

(c) As we have seen in Objective One, students reported seeing alternatives in only a small portion of incidents. Consequently, the question of analysis of courses of action is a subtlety which is not yet at issue for the students surveyed. Nevertheless, the analysis of alternatives will have to be learned at some point if a participative citizenry is to emerge. This fact justifies its inclusion here.

(d) Consider these protocols:

---

*See Objective Four.

A recent issue in my school that sickened me is the Black attitude towards getting things such as Black History, Black culture, Black this and Black that. I feel that as long as we're going this far we might as well have Italian History and Culture as well as all the rest. The next thing you know is they're going to demand Black lunches. I feel that if they don't want to hear about American History then they should just get the hell out and go back to Africa. We live in America. We learn about American History. We don't live in Africa and we don't want to hear about it either.

* * *

When I was in Jackson, Mississippi visiting my grandparents, we heard that there were marchers, so far peaceful, heading toward our street. This naturally upset us, but it also kind of thrilled us, as we had never seen or been in a protest march personally. We were also excited by the prospect of all the T.V. and radio coverage. We heard a lot of noise down the street. We knew that they were coming. We gathered excited at the window.

What they were striking about was some question on rights. It had a lot of coverage on it just as we anticipated. However, something very unexpected happened. The marchers had "recruiters" going on the outskirts of the crowd beckoning people to come out and join. I suppose the reason we did not join them was because of all the bad publicity these demonstrations usually get. You never know when there might be violence so unless you really had a reason you didn't join one of these marches. So, anyway, due to this we did not join any of these marchers. There might have been another solution. If we had known some people in the march it might have changed our minds. But, as it was, neither my parents nor grandparents thought it was a good idea.

Neither of the writers of these protocols describes the basis of the course of action he discusses. No matter what one's position may be on the issue discussed in the first protocol, it should be obvious that the student does not see the basis upon which the black students are making their demands. He does not debunk the contention that students have a right to a voice in the courses taught in their school; nor does he analyze the argument that students have a right to learn about their ethnic history and background, except to say that "we might as well have Italian History and Culture as well as all the rest." He assumes this is not feasible, but he does not argue the point. He does not consider the argument that high schools ought to offer courses in the history and culture of any ethnic group attending the school that wants them. Had he analyzed the course of action he so decries, he not only would have understood it, but also he would have been forced to argue his own position, rather than simply assert it. This is one mark of a mature decision-maker.

While the first student is "sickened" by actions he does not understand, the second is "thrilled" and "excited" by a "protest" march which is incomprehensible to him. Not knowing what the march is about, the student is in no position to analyze its legitimacy. Nevertheless, he considers joining it. He does not go for fear of the consequences: "you never know when there might be violence..." Yet, he does not know anything of the possibility of violence on this particular march; he speaks of "these marches."

(e) Compare these protocols to the thinking of this student:

I know several people who have had illegal abortions in this state. If I am not mistaken, there was a vote on a particular bill which would make abortion accessible to women who want it. It was defeated. I think this is a direct infringement on my rights and is totally prejudiced against the female sex. There was mostly religious opposition to the bill and many legislators, being Catholic, were urged by their clergy to vote against it. Also, the legislators were almost all male. They wouldn't be as receptive to the idea of abortion as a woman might. It seems primitive to let women who do not have enough money to fly to a country where it is permitted to get illegal and dangerous abortions. This is not fair to the poorer women.

I am not Catholic. I wish that the Church would not decide for me a decision which is intensely personal and peculiar to women.

They say the fetus is a living human being and should not be destroyed under any condition. I think that the removal of the unwanted fetus is much more merciful than letting it be born and grow up to be an unwanted child.

Many progressive European countries have shown that abortion is legal and accessible is not harmful to the population's morals. It also probably decreases poverty in families which would be very large.

Whatever one may think of this girl's arguments, she analyzes the course of action she opposed according to its democratic basis and consequences. She does the same for the alternative she supports. As a result, there is much greater likelihood that this girl will be effective in convincing others and acting on her complaint than will the student who complained of the black students' demands. Unfortunately, the first student does not suggest any action which she might undertake in order to redress her grievance; had she acted to change the law, the girl would have shown evidence of becoming a participative citizen. Nevertheless, in the juxtaposition of these two protocols, we can see the greater possibilities of effective action which result from the analysis of options.

Objective Four

(a) THE CITIZEN EMPLOYS NEGOTIATION, MEDIATION, AND ARBITRATION IN RESOLVING CONFLICTS.

(b) If the essence of democratic action is the use and creation of democratic options, then a democratic citizen must employ peaceful, participative techniques to resolve conflicts. The effective use of negotiation and mediation is, therefore, essential to a democrat. A citizenry unwilling and unable to negotiate and compromise to resolve its conflicts is left with the alternatives of unilateral decision-making or violent confrontation.

(c) Our research shows that students' conflicts are most often resolved without attempt at two- or multi-party process resolution. Negotiation, broadly defined as "talks among the people involved," was reported in only about one-sixth of the protocols. Mediation, arbitration and formal voting were negligible.

By contrast, a unilateral decision by an authority was used as an attempt at conflict resolution in the majority of incidents reported.

(d) The following is an example of an incident which presented an opportunity for negotiation which was by-passed:

> The law that no one could loiter about the school was passed a number of years ago but never enforced. All of a sudden, one day a number of policemen pulled up to the school and started threatening students to get into school or they would be arrested.
>
> Of course we protested and a petition was passed around to protest this act, today the petition was taken and the girl who started it suspended and arrested... This girl had a legal right to circulate this petition!!
>
> In the principal's bulletin he now says we will have to go to the lunchroom if we come to school early. This lunchroom seats 112 people and there are 3,000 students in our school. It is now sunny and warm and very enjoyable to sit on the school steps and benches (which are there for sitting, I thought) before school if we get there early. Now they are making us go to a small lunchroom or get arrested for loitering. During the cold winter days, we weren't allowed in our lunchrooms and were to stay outside till school started. The whole business seems rather ludicrous to me and to all the other students besides being very undemocratic!

In this case the administration decided not to allow students to congregate in front of the school building, but the reason for the decision was not voiced to the students. The most salient characteristic of the confrontation was the lack of communication between the administration and the students. The latter protested but did not attempt to talk to the administration. This absence of propensity to discuss conflicts indicates a failure in civic education. The incident ought to have involved discussion at the basic level of decision-making as well as at the level of conflict resolution. When the decisions of the administration are no longer unilateral, but involve participation by those affected, and when the reactive rage of students involves attempt at discussion as well as protest, then we will have evidence of a civic education which is developing citizens skilled in democratic action.

Another example of the failure to negotiate can be seen in one school where many students complained about the principal's decision to punish a whole class for the misbehavior of a few students on a field trip. Here is a typical account:

> Last year the freshman class went up to see A Man for All Seasons as a class trip. When we got inside the theatre we all were pretty good but once the movie started a small bunch of kids began to throw things, such as paper clips, up by the screen. They thought they were being smart by doing this. The next day we were all told to go to the auditorium and our principal gave us all a big lecture about the way we behaved. He then said he knew that it was not the whole class but just a small number and we would not be able to go on any class trips until our senior year,

> if we get that one. We all think this was unfair, to get blamed for something not everybody did.

The students and principal agree that not all the students are guilty, but the latter believes all students should be punished. This situation would seem to offer opportunity for both negotiation and adjudication, but neither side seems to see this. The principal is content to punish the innocent along with the guilty, and the students have no alternative to offer except to say that everyone should not be punished.

Certainly the question of what to do on another field trip is negotiable. Many students complained that there were not enough teachers to supervise, and those who were there did nothing. Perhaps simply increasing the number of supervisors would solve the problem. Perhaps some students would be willing to take responsibility for reporting misbehavior on another trip. In any case, the principal's position and that of the students are not irreconcilable. As for the question of punishment, it is entirely feasible that an impartial trial system could solve the problem of whom to punish.

Here we have another example of students being subjected to a procedure which is antithetical to the democratic ideals of the society in which they live. The above incident demonstrates the fact that students are not prone to see negotiation as a means of conflict resolution; it also suggests why this may be so. A successful civic education seen from the ideal of participation would have used the otherwise unfortunate circumstance under discussion to allow students to partake in negotiation and arbitration procedures.

(e) As might be expected, examples of negotiation, mediation, and arbitration are difficult to find in the data. While the protocols to be quoted may appear to be trivial, they are significant simply for the manner in which the conflicts were resolved. First, an instance of arbitration:

> One day after school this girl stamped the senior bench with her date of graduation. Since she isn't well liked by the seniors, they took it to one of the assistant principals. It was decided that it would be brought up in the Student-Court...
>
> A teacher who was in charge of the student government, gave the girl's lawyer plenty of advice. The other lawyer didn't know too much about defending his case against her.
>
> As it turned out, she was proven not guilty because of the lack of witnesses against her. Several of the witnesses called were either absent or purposely evaded the whole truth in the matter.
>
> I don't think this was fair because of the absence of witnesses, and the free advice given to only one lawyer.

Despite the writer's reservations about the trial, it served to afford the accused student a chance to defend herself and put the burden of proof on the plaintiff, which is a rare and salutary procedure in high school. But, perhaps even more important, it served an educational function in the school: many students received first-hand knowledge of how trials are conducted. The author of

the protocol raises the issues of witnesses refusing to testify and lawyer competency as being crucial factors in jurisprudential procedures. She shows more evidence of having thought about what constitutes a just manner of dealing with the accused than most students interviewed. It should be noted that she does not say, "This is unfair because the girl marked up our bench and should not get away with it," which would be a typical response.

Here is an example of negotiation:

> At the time when we were working on the senior show this year we had a conflict. There was a committee chosen with 2 chairmen to write the show. Weeks of work went into it and then what was called a "vocal minority" toned down the show. This vocal minority had never offered to help while it was being written. They said it was offensive, obscene, and above all - perverted. The chairmen were put on the defensive in a very personal way. The officers of the term then stepped in and a "grievance meeting" was held at which the "vocal minority" had a chance to voice its protests while the show chairman listened. This was the best way to handle the situation because the vocal minority felt appeased. It was too bad that so many personal feelings were involved which shouldn't have been.

In this case the dispute was apparently resolved by a discussion between the two parties to the conflict. A more common type of resolution process would be for the majority either not to listen to the minority or to ask the principal to tell the minority to be quiet. The simple fact that the two parties heard each other out is evidence of a more mature sense of democratic principles than one is wont to find in the high school, and is an example of what civic education ought to cultivate. These students, who resolved their dispute by two-party discussion, are more prepared to be participants in societal affairs than are the students who were all unilaterally punished on their field trip for the acts of a few. The latter were left with feelings of bitterness and little sense of democratic principles.

Objective Five

(a) THE CITIZEN UNDERSTANDS AND ANALYZES ISSUES FROM VIEWPOINTS OTHER THAN HIS OWN.

(b) If problems are to be resolved democratically, citizens must comprehend the point of view of their adversaries. To lack this capacity or propensity is to lapse into dogmatism. The contrary attitude is necessary for serious negotiation of conflict which, we have seen, is a crucial aspect of the democratic process. A one-sided viewpoint does not allow for the flexibility necessary for meaningful, peaceful conflict resolution.

(c) The data suggest that grasping the opposing viewpoint is an ability which is sorely lacking in most junior and senior high school students. We have seen that more than one alternative is not commonly perceived. This fact alone suggests the inability to see alternative points of view, but there is further evidence. The research staff used various techniques to draw responses describing more than one viewpoint of an issue. None of these techniques produced results which differed from the previous findings; almost all viewpoints expressed were those held by the writers.

(d) The following protocol demonstrates the inability to see the opponent's viewpoint, even when specifically asked for it. The first part of the protocol:

> I was sitting in English listening to my fellow students deliver oral speeches to the class. My girl friend's pen dropped and in giving it back a few words passed between us. At this point the teacher got up and lectured the entire class for disrupting the student giving his speech. These reports were being given for several days and during each class the teacher was talking to another student about his grades etc... I became aggravated that we had to sit and listen to the reports but the teacher would talk and carry on. When I brought up this point she said she was different and she tells us what to do, we don't tell her. Also that we make the person who is giving the report nervous when we distract them. I tried telling her that she had the same effect on that person as we do. She then said "I feel there is no further point in discussing this so let's proceed with the reports."

The second part of the protocol was written in response to this question: "If the person in your story with the opposite point of view was telling us about it, how would he tell it, and why would he have ended it differently from what you would have?" The answer:

> The teacher would have argued some more and told us that we are the students and it is our job to follow instructions and not question them. After letting us argue with her for a while she would have said if I hear one more word on the subject the class will report for detention, that way the students would keep quiet so they don't have to stay after.

Clearly, the student cannot recognize the teacher's position. There is nothing in the second part which is not in the first part. The second part bears no mention of order in the classroom, courtesy to the speaker, or any other point which the teacher may have had in mind when she reproached the students. It is interesting to note that the only legitimate point the writer makes for the teacher, that "we make the person who is giving the report nervous when we distract them," is not repeated in the second portion, suggesting that the student becomes less, rather than more, sympathetic to the teacher when specifically asked for the latter's point of view.

There is no dilemma for this student. The teacher is hypocritical, unreasonable, and wrong. There is nothing to negotiate or discuss, save the teacher's errors. Consequently, the student has no difficulty determining right and wrong in this situation. The agony of questioning one's own position is avoided, since no other viewpoint is admitted into awareness. Let us consider another example:

> My big problem is my American history teacher. I'm passing the course with a good mark, being B to A. But the thing is that I always sleep in class and before I can really doze off she starts yelling at me. In plain English I think this teacher is a bitch and she's depriving me of my freedom. This scene takes place almost everyday in - High School. The teacher started the dispute between us. 20 other students were there and the problem which always comes up is putting our head on the desk and sleeping. I tried to handle the problem by

> sticking up for my rights and telling her that so long as I'm passing the course why can't I every now and then place my head on the desk and sleep. So every now and then when I decide to sleep we have that same old argument again and as far as I know there's no other way the problem can be handled...

Again, the teacher is the villain. She "is" the problem; she started the trouble; her alleged unseemly character is the cause of the difficulty. The author never admits that there are opinions other than his own view, that anyone passing a course may sleep during it whenever he wishes. Consequently, he sees no dilemma to be resolved and places the blame entirely on the teacher.

In the two examples discussed we can see a common practice of many high school students: refuse to consider other opinions and one never need question his own assumptions. But the consequences of this maneuver for decision-making are clear. One cannot be a just, skillful decision-maker without careful consideration of all sides of an issue. But this is precisely what is required of a participative citizenry. Only when the citizen is willing and able to put his own position through the deliberative process of testing it against other points of view will we have evidence of a civic education which is helping develop citizenry sufficiently adept at decision-making to become participative.

(e) To obtain an idea of the type of response which shows evidence of the author's having gone through this process of deliberation, consider this protocol:

> A few years ago a fifth candidate for G.O. president was nominated from the floor of the G.O. Council. (A legal means of nomination). However, one of the requirements of nomination is that the nominee may not have been suspended. This nominee had been suspended once for disrespect to the flag: he neither stood nor pledged his allegiance. At the time a hue and cry went up, and finally the administration struck the suspension from his record.
>
> When he was nominated the question of his right to not pledge came up again. Here are the two arguments:
>
> 1) Anyone has the right to either say the pledge or not. Actually the "Pledge" is nothing but work repeated day after day without meaning. Just because he refused to be a sheep and say these words means nothing except he wants to save his breath, and maybe express this point of view. It has nothing to do with patriotism.
>
> 2) By not saying the "Pledge," and not even standing this boy was showing disrespect for his flag and the country it represents. Just because the words may be overused, the thought of standing in respect for the flag overcomes the monotony of the words. Until he leaves this country and his citizenship, he owes his country at least respect, if nothing else.
>
> I believe that one should have the right to not say the pledge, or even to not stand in respect for it. However, one should stand in respect of the rights of other students who do respect the flag. By not standing, or even leaving the room for those few minutes (as one teacher advocated) this boy was disrespectful to his fellow students' rights. One should have

> the right to not be respectful to a thing or person; but in claiming the right to not stand or pledge this boy was disrupting the rights of other students by being a disruptive influence.

While this writer does not consider all the possible viewpoints on this issue, he does show the ability to represent faithfully an opinion he does not hold. This is the sine qua non of democratic decision-making.

Objective Six

(a) THE CITIZEN SEES DEMOCRATIC ISSUES IN THE PROBLEMS OF OTHERS, AS WELL AS IN HIS OWN LIFE.

(b) An integral element of participation is concern for the rights of others. To participate is to take part; and this implies concern for the problems and rights of other people. To allow the rights of others to be violated is to lapse into an exclusively private world which is antithetical to the development of a participative society. The democrat, therefore, cannot apply one standard to himself and a less stringent one to others. Therefore, the democratic citizen must be concerned with democracy as it functions in the lives of other people.

(c) The evidence from our study suggests that students are not as involved with the democratic problems of other people as a participative society might wish them to be. Twice as many protocols were written in the first person as in the third person. This fact indicates that the concerns of most students with respect to democracy center about themselves. While self interest is a legitimate principle on which to base democratic action, it is not a sufficient one. The participative citizen must also concern himself with the rights of other people.

(d) Consider this typical example of the lack of perception of others' problems:

> This high school was exposed to the stupid and assinine message that was handed out (by) a group of radicals who are afraid to expose themselves and speak out. The problems were the students or aliens were complaining about privileges that any person in another country would be glad to have. These pupils are free to leave this country at any time or they can shut up.

This student is not interested in the problems brought up by other students in their leaflets. Rather than argue that their demands are unwarranted, he refuses to consider them. The last sentence implies that this student does not recognize the right of students to protest publicly. As he seems to question the right of dissent, he cannot be concerned with the problems in democracy, whether his own or others.

Here is another example of the lack of concern for democratic principles:

> Being that I (am) not concerned with what goes on in my school, there isn't much I can say about it. My only concern is that I get out. The topic that I will write about isn't really that important. It deals with the use of the phone in my house...

There seems to be a relationship between a lack of concern for the problems of others and a lack of concern for democratic principles. To be concerned with a principle requires extending one's concerns beyond immediate self interests. The lack of concern for others goes hand in hand with lack of concern for democratic principles. Consequently, the views presented in these protocols represent positions antithetical to those which must be assumed by citizens of a democracy.

(e) As an example of a student's concern for the problems of his peers, consider this:

> In this school, four years ago a new program was instituted which provided for admitting girls from "culturally underdeveloped" areas without the same requirements as other girls.
>
> One day during official period, an eighth grade class was making a normal amount of noise. The official teacher, who was new, was completely lost as to controlling the class. The chairman of the department, who is about sixty-five years old, came storming into the classroom to yell at the girls. Meanwhile, right across the hall there was a noisier group.
>
> The old teacher was furious with the class for making noise. She accused them, with pointed and absolute attention to the black and Puerto Rican girls, of lowering the standards of the school. She was acting in a very unsympathetic fashion, and the official teacher had already given the girls permission to talk and play cards.
>
> At the end of her philippic, I was very upset because I had thought that teachers stressed individuality in students, and that they were not only spreaders of wisdom, but also empathetic people.
>
> My choices after the incident were to either ignore the situation, to let it blow over or to discuss this with the girls and a higher authority. Since I was very upset, I went to one teacher, and later I made an appointment with the principal and the class for the following day where we discussed the woman's attitudes and tried to clarify the incident.

This girl not only showed concern for other persons' problems, but also was willing to act on this concern. This type of active interest seems to be lacking in many students; yet it is difficult to imagine a participative society without a large portion of the population holding it to at least some extent.

Objective Seven

(a) THE CITIZEN RECOGNIZES THE VALUE AND UTILIZES THE POWER OF GROUP ACTION.

(b) Being a system based on popular will, democracy is more amenable to change proposed by groups than individuals. This does not apply as much to legal issues, of course. But where there is a question of social policy not under the jurisdiction of the courts, a group is more likely to achieve significant results

than are disparate individuals. The formation of organizations and political groups is the traditional means of attempting to achieve political results in our society. Citizens who act only as individuals do not utilize all the resources possible to have action taken on their views.

(c) While the protagonists of the incidents were groups as often as individuals, upon reading a large number of protocols one can easily see that the power of group action is still not grasped. To realize the objective under discussion, the citizen must know how to use group pressure to achieve results. This requires seeing that one's own problems are shared by others and effectively organizing the resources of those who share a grievance. Many of the protocols are written in the plural form only because students feel they are common victims of administrative injustice; they do not act as a unit to redress the injustices they perceive.

(d) In the protocols quoted below the attempt will be made to show that many students do not perceive the potential power of group action to realize democratic objectives. For example, in one school many students are concerned about the same issue:

> The problem that has been in the school for some time is the closing of the bathroom on all the floors, but the first. I think the bathrooms should be open on all floors because of the distance of the bathroom on the first floor...
>
> * * *
>
> In this high school the teachers closed up all bathrooms except for two which are on the main floor. This started a problem. The students didn't go for the idea. They think since there are bathrooms on each floor, why can't we use them.
>
> The students got together, put posters up demanding the bathrooms to be opened. The students said why should the people on the fourth floor have to walk downstairs to the main floor just to use the bathroom, when all the teachers have to do is open all bathrooms.
>
> The teachers said that the reason for not opening the bathroom is because of the high rate of drug addiction. The students believe that closing the bathrooms wouldn't stop the students from using drugs... So I think as well as the rest of the students that the bathrooms should be opened.
>
> The teachers didn't do anything about it, the bathrooms are still closed.
>
> This problem could have been handled by opening the bathrooms and have the teachers check every once in a while.
>
> * * *
>
> ...I feel the bathrooms should be open on every floor. This sort of thing should be stopped, in order to go to the bathroom in the

school you have to travel all the way down to the first floor, and by the time you get there, you don't know what might happen...

* * *

Students were against the teachers because they did not want to open up the bathroom on 2, 3, 4 floors of the school building and it was unfair to the students because if they have to go to the bathroom, the person would have to go all the way downstairs instead of going to the bathroom where the floor is at.

Finally, one Spanish protocol, translated:

The only thing that I am in disagreement with in this school is that there are only two open bathrooms. And what happens is this: when someone is on a floor that isn't the first and has to use a bathroom he has to run downstairs. Why is that? There is more than one bathroom on each floor. Why have the rest of the bathrooms closed? What reason can they have for closing those bathrooms?

The only reason, I believe, is that many kids have the bad habit of smoking in the bathrooms. But I believe that keeping only one bathroom open is worse because a person without this bad habit has to go in against his will. I am one of those people and I do not like the smell of smoke.

All these students and many others complained about the same issue. But there is only one reference to a group activity aimed at changing the situation, and this action was certainly inappropriate. The students put up posters. But there are many other options open to students who can muster wide support. They could have organized a group, drawn up a petition, asked to negotiate, attempted to elicit faculty support, or performed many other such actions. The fact that none of these ideas apparently occurred to the students of this school illustrates the failure of high school students in general to see the importance of group activity for accomplishing a goal through the democratic process.

This objective can be looked at in conjunction with Objective Three. The type of problem being considered here is perhaps best solved by negotiation. But a prior condition for negotiation is the organization of a group which will become one party to the negotiations. Thus, the ability and will to negotiate must be distinguished from recognition of the power of group action which may manifest itself in negotiations or in other ways.

Again, we find an essential aspect of the democratic process is not being learned by high school students. Without a sound grasp of the role of groups in obtaining one's desires, the citizen will not be ready to play a participative role in his society.

(e) At times students do see that they can be effective if they organize themselves into groups:

Last spring certain negro students in the school were involved with the police, when a disturbance broke out in the town. Exactly

what happened we'll never know, but there was shooting and apparently some innocent bystanders were hurt. According to the witnesses, the police had exerted unnecessary force that night. They labeled it "police brutality" as a result. We had an assembly the next day and some of the Negro parents proposed a "police brutality march" that afternoon. The purpose being to show that we opposed the police action taken the night before. I made the decision to march with the group. I was deeply motivated by the concern of the students who weren't involved that night - but more important I took pride in the fact that black and white students would be proving to the community that afternoon that we could work together. We had a common cause and skin color would not stop anyone from marching. In making my decision I knew I would be opposing the wishes of my parents and the town authorities - but I felt it was worth the argument. Here we were, as a student body, organizing to protest the existing authority. I knew it was a big step to take... I feel that we all did right that afternoon. I feel that, as a result, the police will be more cautious when dealing with racial issues. They realize there is power in the community when we work together.

The students in this situation saw something they felt was wrong and organized themselves to undertake a peaceful activity to change it. Of course, there is no way of knowing if their actions had any effect, but the belief in the possibility of accomplishment is there. These students have travelled much along the road toward becoming effective participants than are the students quoted above who can only complain despairingly and cannot see their common interests. The girl who wrote this protocol clearly felt that her interests were at one with those of her peers; consequently, she could decide to march with them in a common cause. The effective citizen is often he who can judiciously seek out those with interests that coincide with his own and work in concert with them for common goals.

Furthermore, a striking feature of this protocol, when juxtaposed with those above, is the lack of frustration and bitterness. This is a common characteristic of those protocols in which the writers consider the outcome of their incidents to have been successful.

Objective Eight

(a) THE CITIZEN DISTINGUISHES PERSONAL ISSUES AND CONFLICTS FROM INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES AND CONFLICTS, AND ATTACKS THE TWO ACCORDINGLY.

(b) In order to deal effectively with any problem one must be able to discern those aspects of the problem which are institutional, i.e., which exist due to the nature and/or functioning of an institution, and those aspects which are a function of a particular individual or group of individuals. A person should be held responsible for only those actions over which he has control. A sign of a mature, thoughtful citizen is the ability to see when institutional change is needed. All of this implies that the student should be able to see and analyze options with respect to institutions as well as with individuals and groups.

(c) The data show that the great majority of incidents reported were seen by their writers as conflicts with persons, or groups of persons. Institutional conflicts were reported in less than one-fourth of the protocols. Yet most of the issues concern conflicts with school decisions, policies, or rules and regulations;

and about two-thirds are seen as problems with authorities. These facts suggest that students are not seeing institutional aspects or implications of problems. They tend to see persons as responsible without realizing that the causes of a problem may be with institutional difficulties which are beyond the control of an individual or group.

(d) The protocols quoted below illustrate the tendency to overlook institutional implications of problems:

> A portion of the students in this school would like to have a voice in the Parents-Teachers-Association. They would like to have a voice in what laws should be made and how they should be enforced. This opportunity came a few weeks ago. A student panel was selected from the (student) body on the current issues concerning the students and the school. A few of the issues raised included cutting classes, after school activities, various courses, and smoking.
>
> One of the student representatives felt that the school should include more activities to keep students from getting into trouble after school. Another question raised was why shouldn't better students be able to cut classes. The student felt if a student was getting a high grade, was bored in class, and could just as well learn the material from the textbook as from class discussions he should be able to have a study hall, which might have been more significant than sitting in class. The students also feel that smoking should be possible in certain areas of the school building. The parents raised the point that smoking was dangerous cause for fires. The student brought out the point that the teachers smoke in the lounges and that it is more dangerous to smoke in lounges than in the halls.
>
> The students feel they should have more voice in making and enforcing laws. The session ended by 1 student saying that the students were not going to discuss anything else with the parents until the parents were ready to listen.
>
> I think the parents could have listened more to what the students had to say than arguing with them.

All of the issues raised by the students were aspects of the school system over which the parents have no control. The question of smoking must take into account the state law prohibiting the use of tobacco by minors under 18 years of age. The other issues, such as skipping classes, are dependent on policy decisions of the school and district-wide administrations. This is not to say that the parents and their organization could not be of great help to the students in achieving their goals. But the students did not see the parents as possible allies in effecting reform through the system; they seemed to expect the parents to act alone to change policy.

In this case, recognition of the institutional aspects of a problem implies understanding how the system is organized to make decisions. Only on the basis of this understanding can action be taken on the problem according to how the decisions and policies affecting it are made.

There is a further dimension to this question of institutional implications. Often an institution is so structured that the individuals acting within it pursue courses of action which they may not wish to pursue, but to which they can see no alternative. For example, in many protocols students complain of being unjustly punished. The teacher or principal, they say, often punish innocent students who have no opportunity to defend themselves. But there is little recognition of the teacher's role as law enforcement officer, prosecutor, judge, and jury. A typical example:

> Frequently in this study hall we have in the cafeteria the teacher in charge wants everyone to be quiet and study. Several students have done their homework at home and are in the study hall because that's where they are scheduled to be. Only 10 or 15 out of 100 or 200 are talking and not studying. The teacher can't catch anyone so the whole study hall has to come after school. The few who are making trouble are punished just as badly as the ones who are perhaps studying for a test. We can't write up a petititon or we get suspended by the principal.

This situation reflects an institutional problem: there are no procedural means for the teacher to bring this student's complaint before an impartial body, so she must accuse, judge, and punish by herself. The student places the blame on the teacher without recognition of the institutional situation in which the teacher finds herself. Furthermore, the fact that the students have no chance to defend themselves before an arbiter is a problem of the school as an institution. If the student were to recognize this fact, he would take the first step on the road toward effective action to improve the situation. Complaining about the teacher and principal will not serve to rectify the problem.

(e) In rare instances, a student will see beyond the personal element in an incident. For example:

> Every school has its poor teachers and ours is no exception. I had, in 9th and 11th grade a very old, very poor teacher. She had no contact with the students, no concept of what we were, as people and students, no ideas, in other words the classes were frighteningly dull, and everyone agree (other teachers included) that she should not be teaching.
>
> Many students called for her dismissal, saying that it wasn't "fair" (democratic) to subject so many students to a complete waste of time. The answer was that she had been teaching for so long and had tenure. The teacher was kept.
>
> Question: Is it democratic to make many suffer at the hands of a poor teacher, in order to protect her from joblessness and/or retirement and/or unhappiness.
>
> Question: Is it "democratic" as long as we, as a society, have made no provisions for the old in terms of jobs and social set ups, to fire a teacher who has no life but her 'teaching'?

The remarkable aspect of this protocol is that this student sees that there is more to the problem than getting rid of an old, ineffective teacher. The writer sees that the socity "has made no provisions" for people such as the

teacher she describes. The student recognizes an institutional problem of dealing with the elderly is involved, as well as the students' desire for better teaching. A more typical response to this situation would simply have demanded removal of the teacher and perhaps included a condemnation of a particular authority for not removing her.

Objective Nine

(a) THE CITIZEN GRASPS AND ACTS ON THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED IN CONCRETE PROBLEMS IN DEMOCRACY.

(b) Principles cannot be seen; they must be inferred from an immediate situation. Nevertheless, they play an important role in democratic decision-making. While each of two people arguing about a problem in democracy may have an interest in having his side emerge successfully, both would argue the point on the basis of a democratic principle or value. Furthermore, each person would contend that his principle should take precedence over that of his adversary. Democratic problems cannot be resolved by recourse to one's personal desires; the legitimacy of those desires must be demonstrated. That is why recognition of principles in concrete problems is crucial to democratic decision-making.

(c) The evidence gathered in our study points to the conclusion that students are not abstracting from the concrete events of their lives. Conflict with an institution requires the individual to abstract from his concrete personal situation. However, only one-fourth of the protocols reported conflicts with institutions, even though two-thirds of the reported conflicts were with authority figures. The vast majority of the protocols deal with the concrete events of students' daily lives. Issues such as political events, that extend beyond one's immediate situation, are relatively rare.

(d) Consider this protocol:

> I refuse to accept democracy as the best form of decision-making. Democracy assumes that what is good for most individuals is the best for the group as a whole. It does not take into account the protection of minority feelings in practice, much as the theory says it does. Democracy, especially in small group situations, serves only to hurt feelings and ruin friendships and causes such hatred that absolutely nothing can be accomplished.
>
> The senior class recently had problems dealing with its Senior Day Show and Sing. A group of a few people attempted to take out their hatred of the whole school using the democratic procedures involved in the sing. Though this small group used very democratic methods including election, these actions almost caused the cancellation of Senior Day itself, and consequently a very disappointed student body.
>
> The situation was handled by an opposing group calling for reconsideration of previous actions, and an honest discussion of reasons given for actions. The vote was taken again, and Senior Day was finally held to the enjoyment of the whole school.

Both groups used democratic methods and both groups managed to cause hurt feelings and hatred.

Democracy is good?

This protocol demonstrates a failure to perceive the right of every group and individual to express its or his opinion. The student saw feelings hurt and her emotional reaction prevented her from seeing the principles involved. It is one thing to reject a political philosophy and another not to see it. This student shows no evidence of seeing the principle of democratic decision-making; had she done so, she would have been able to balance this principle against her views about the hurt feelings at the meeting.

Furthermore, the student did not grasp the principles involved in the question of personal abuse. She could have considered the objectionable statements to be transgressions of freedom of debate, parliamentary procedure, or other principles. In this way, she would have argued on principle that certain statements were not allowable. But she does not see principles and so argues on the basis of personal feelings.

Here is another example of this type of argument:

> The female school nurse walked into the boys' room right past the toilets with no doors and proceeded into the back where she found a boy smoking a cigarette. She issues after school detention to a student. I consider the process of women entering a men's lavatory filthy. Yet she was justified by the other teachers who said there was no rule against her doing this. I'm sure if I were to go into the girls' lavatory I would be suspended for I'm only a male student. According to this story if I were a male teacher I could walk into a crowded girls' lavatory.

The striking aspect of this protocol is that the student does not say the nurse has no <u>right</u> to enter the bathroom, nor that the students have a right to privacy. The writer says only that he considers the nurse's behavior "filthy." Again, there is a complaint, but no argument. This is because feelings, rather than principles are discussed. Had the student mentioned the principle of right to privacy, he could have argued that this principle should take precedence over the nurse's duty to pursue violators of the school rules.

These two examples are typical of the lack of ability to conceptualize and act on principle. They also demonstrate the weak reasoning which results from the failure to grasp the principles inherent in concrete situations.

(e) Compare the protocols quoted above with this one:

> Sometimes situations happen in school which are not technically democratic. If schools claim they are preparing us for the "outside" world, they should really try to uphold democratic principles more than they do.
>
> I remember one such example. A boy walked in late and the teacher demanded him to get a pass. He opened his mouth to speak, probably to explain where he had been, but the teacher would have none of that. She

still insisted on the boy's getting a pass. He bent his head in submission and walked out the door...

First of all, if students are being taught with the distinct goal in mind of preparing them for a democracy, treating them as subjects of a king isn't going to help very much. Still, they should have some sense of taking advice from superiors.

The main problem which I feel arises from this incident is what it shows the students about fairness and justice. Obviously, the teacher wasn't being fair. She is justified somewhat by saying that the student isn't her equal. Well, yes, and no. They aren't equal in the duties they perform within the school. Yet, when it comes to justice, they should both have equal rights.

For these reasons, I believe the teacher should have heard the boy out. Maybe he still deserves the punishment of detention, or whatever, but that punishment is no good if he doesn't serve it with a feeling that the punishment is just. His idea of justice will be warped; he will not be ready for a democratic society beyond school....

This girl has a feel for democratic principles to such an extent that she perceives a number of them in an incident which would be given scant attention by most students. Equal application of justice to those of unequal status, the teaching of democracy by practicing it, and the legitimacy of coercive punishment are all raised as questions of principle inherent in the issue. Unfortunately, the perception of these principles is not sufficient to lead the girl to act on them. That would be the next stage of civic development.

Objective Ten

(a) THE CITIZEN RELATES HIS PRINCIPLES TO RELEVANT INCIDENTS.

(b) We have seen in Objective Four that when confronted with an issue, students do not commonly see the abstract problems involved. But the contrary problem also exists. Some students seem to be bothered by abstract problems without being able to perceive them in concrete incidents. This seemingly bizarre situation appears to lead to a great deal of frustration as will be seen in the protocols quoted below. This would seem to follow from the lack of opportunity for effective decision-making and participation which must result from an inability to tie a bothersome problem to a concrete situation.

(c) As mentioned above, we asked students for dilemma incidents. However, in about one-seventh of the protocols abstract problems were stated, but no specific incident was mentioned. As the instructions specifically called for a description of an incident, we can infer that about one-seventh of the students who responded to the questionnaire were not able to relate the problem they saw to a concrete instance. In this case, effective participation is impeded by the inability to think in concrete terms.

(d) Consider these examples:

A group never has trouble being as democratic as its members wish it to be. If it does have trouble (the) members opinions or feelings can't be very strong. Also when making a decision "what is the democratic thing to do" rarely has a large influence on the outcome. Instead, an individual or group's values and norms are the main factors when deciding something.

This conflict has been prevalent in society ever since man became fairly satisfied with his way of life. Ethnocentric ties have always been a hindrance in international affairs, or multi-culture societies. Recently the failure to even look at new ideas and ways of life by society has caused a very large conflict sometimes bordering on revolution. Present life has become split into 2 planes. One refusing to see new possible improvements, and the other refusing to conform to set ways. Society cannot exist in this state and riots, sit-ins, etc. show what can and will continue if some kind of compromise is not soon reached.

* * *

I think the time has come when institutions must face the fact that they have been neglecting their responsibilities to the individual and not to the minority groups who have been struggling through obstacles caused by the ignorance and indifference of these so-called democratic institutions. The problems are many that face the people of the Americas without having to use violent means of obtaining what they want, but if they cannot get what society so calls equality, then there seems to be no other way to reach the minds of men who want a chance to prove to themselves and to others that they can improve not only themselves but also help others who need desperately a strong and sincere way of help and guidance in order to raise up from the faith of their environment and have decent rights without someone threatening to steal their liberty and hopes for their future and for their children. The minority groups are rebelling because they see no other way in which to be heard.

Both of these essays raise interesting matters of principle. The first contends that what is "democratic" is not generally a factor in decision-making; rather, decisions are made on the basis of values and life-styles. The young, who are introducing new values, are in conflict with the old, who adhere to the traditional values. The second argues that the institutions of our society are not properly responsive to the needs of certain groups. The question of what procedure these groups should resort to then arises.

The principles involved in these protocols are not related in any way to concrete incidents. This failure is as harmful to democratic action as the inability to see principles involved in incidents. Although the writers grasp insightfully questions of principle, these questions must be tied to real experiences if they are to aid the person in his role as citizen. Democratic action requires both principle and experience. A civic education which teaches only principle will not be successful in producing a participative citizenry. The values, beliefs, principles, and doctrines of democracy must be seen in the citizen's life-experiences if a citizenry capable of democratic action is to be developed.

(e) Compare these protocols to the following:

The problem of censorship has been rising more and more often in today's society. Television shows such as the Smothers Brothers, radio programs, theaters and publications have been ruined or put out of business over the question of what should or shouldn't be allowed to be said or done, and who should have the power to say what goes and what doesn't.

This school has a school paper. This year the editor-in-chief did not stand by and permit the faculty advisor to censor the paper. He felt, and I suppose understandably that most of the articles and poems that she thought unsuitable were either just expressing opinions of a group (no matter how large or small) in the school or else (when the words "damn" or "hell" were debated) not meant to offend the few who might be upset. After all, she said, it is a student paper and should therefore be written as the students choose. Opinions, no matter how unpopular and facts, no matter how disturbing should be published in a paper. The advisor, however, felt that an adult should have final say about the paper. Kids, she felt, do not always know who they are hurting or how a charge of libel could work against them...

This student is as concerned with the principle he sees in question here as the two students quoted above are with theirs. The difference is that he sees the principle which concerns him operating in a concrete situation. Consequently, the author of the censorship protocol is more prepared to act on a violation of the principle he believes in.

Summary

By way of summary, we can see that the ten objectives discussed in this section have as a common goal the development of citizens competent in the intricacies of democratic decision-making. The research study identified a number of weaknesses in students' abilities to perceive and act on crucial aspects of democratic problems. These weaknesses must be the focal point of civic education of the 1970's if we are to become a society in which citizens have the capacities and the collective will to govern themselves.

The key to civic competency is the making of democratic decisions. Crucial to this capacity is the ability to discern and create the existence of courses of action which are subsumed under the concept of democracy. The critical problem for any citizen is to attempt to achieve his goal while involving all interested parties and assuring that the rights of all are respected. That is why negotiation, mediation, and arbitration were pointed out as the exemplary modes of democratic conflict resolution.

But the identification and/or creation of viable alternatives does not guarantee the best use will be made of them; nor does the analysis of options. A mature decision must be based on considerations which extend beyond the immediate personal situation in which the citizen may find himself. Crucial elements in this regard are the viewpoints and problems of others, group factors, institutional implications, and relevant democratic principles. The ideal citizen weighs each of these elements in order to participate in civic affairs in a manner which maximizes his ability to act for his own and the common welfare.

Junior and senior high school students show themselves deficient in their capacity to see, create, and analyze democratic channels of action, as well as in their ability to consider the relevant factors which are involved in any course of action. These two broad civic incompetencies define a level of civic-mindedness which is far below the stage of mature civic action which ought to be the goal of all civic education.

Until this point there has been no discussion of degrees of civic-mindedness. This omission was valid as the objectives may be useful as goals at which teachers of all age children could aim. Nevertheless, the failure to take into account stages of civic development does leave the objectives incomplete. It is not the case that all students are at the same level of readiness for civic action. If this manual is to have maximum utility, the objectives must be supplemented with a description of the two distinct levels of civic-mindedness which emerge from the study of democratic dilemmas. It is to this description that we now turn.

Preface to Development Guidelines

It is an oversimplification to say that students lack the civic competence required of democratic citizens. Junior high school students evidence less competence along crucial dimensions of democratic decision-making than senior high students; thus, the latter are more ready for the types of experiences in democratic living which are essential to participative citizens. This fact is of great importance for the educator.

While the goals of civic education as defined in the objectives are the same for all students, youngsters of different age levels are at different points on the road toward becoming fully functioning citizens in a democratic society. This manual must include an account of these developmental differences if it is to be maximally useful to the educator. The learning experiences of students of democracy must be guided by consideration of the types of civic action which a group of students is capable of and willing to undertake. The citizenship objectives served to define the ends toward which civic education is to aim; the developmental guidelines will indicate where the process of achieving those ends ought to begin.

This section of the manual consists of guidelines, not objectives. The position taken here is that developmental data should not be automatically translated into objectives. The fact that older students do something is not sufficient reason to prescribe that younger students do the same. Nevertheless, for the reasons indicated above, educators should be aware of different stages of civic competence. Age differences lead naturally to the concept of "guidelines." This section is meant to point the educator toward the most useful starting points for the teaching of civic action to students of different levels of civic-mindedness. The developmental guidelines delineate the degree of civic-mindedness of junior and senior high school students, from both cognitive and interest-centered points of view.

To determine developmental differences, four junior high schools were compared with the high schools they feed. This comparison, termed the quasi-longitudinal study, was made on four types of school: (1) urban; (2) suburban blue collar; (3) suburban white collar; and (4) a school for gifted girls. In the urban comparison an elementary school which feeds the junior high was added;

however, since the elementary school data exist for only one category and for that school the sample is small, no use is made of the data.

All the developmental data are taken from these comparisons. Only in cases in which there are clear differences between junior and senior high school students on a particular issue have we considered there to be sufficient evidence for a developmental difference.

The outline for the guidelines is as follows:

(a) A terse statement of the guideline.

(b) An explanation and elaboration of (a), including the values implied in the terse statement.

(c) The basis for the guideline in the quasi-longitudinal study.

(d) Examples of typical protocols from both junior and senior high schools, illustrating the developmental difference, and a discussion of how they do so.

Guideline One

(a) JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' PROBLEMS ARE FOCUSED MORE ON THE STUDENTS THEMSELVES THAN ARE THOSE OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.

(b) The problems at issue in the lives of junior high students are, for the most part, personal. The elementary school children wrote about problems in which the writer was protagonist much more often than did junior high school students, and the latter wrote more about themselves than did senior high students. The concerns of elementary school and junior high students are usually their own problems. While this is true to some degree across the range of students sampled; it is significantly more true the younger the group of students. As students grow older, it appears that their concerns "de-center," i.e., gradually shift from dominance with one's self to include a greater concern with the problems of other people.

The civic teacher should be aware of this developmental difference. Junior high school students are feeling the need to learn democracy as it affects them; they generally do not become involved in problems which have no direct bearing on their lives. In senior high school, students are more likely to take interest in the way democratic principles operate in other people's lives, although even there the predominant civic concern is with one's personal life.

(c) All the cross-sectional comparisons show a much greater quantity of first-person incidents in junior than senior high. This fact demonstrates that there is a developmental trend toward increasing involvement with non-personal problems.

(d) The following is a typical kind of concern of junior high students:

> One day I wanted to go home to fetch some books I'd left behind. I went to the high school office and asked them if I could go (if I'd just gone I would have got suspended). First of all, the secretaries

said, "Do you have a note?" I told them they could phone my parents, but they said, "I'm sorry we've got to have a note on file." I pleaded with them, but "it's the rules" was the only answer.

Now this was really annoying. Why should there be such stupid rules? My parents could give me permission over the phone, and how was I supposed to be prepared with a note for accidentally having left my books behind? Anyway a telephone conversation is more true than a note. You can forge notes. "It's the school rules" is the most aggravating answer I ever got to a question...

I just walked around school with no books that day. I couldn't learn anything.

This is the type of issue most likely to concern the junior high student. The focus is on the desire of the student to return home to get his books. On the other hand, some high school students may show great concern for other people:

Last summer I was in a NSF science course which was quite advanced and dealt with rather complicated material. One of the girls didn't belong. She had grown up in a town in North Carolina and had gone to an all black school. She was placed in the midst of fifteen middle class students. She was completely lost in the course, and ended up never doing her homework and coming late to class.

She was in the midst of a white society and she became a complete introvert, not even talking to the other black students who were in different courses. In her school in North Carolina, she was second in her class, but her SAT's were in the low 400's.

I feel that the experience was very harmful to her. She became totally alienated from everybody, especially the black students from the North (who became an integral part of the summer program).

...To try to be democratic and give her a chance was un-democratic in the sense that it hurt her. She left before the program ended. If she was accepted in a simpler course which she was ready for, the problem would not have arisen."

The author of this protocol demonstrates a democratic thinking process in her feeling for another person. This type of concern is to be contrasted with the first protocol in which the writer's desires are the focus. For most junior high students the first protocol is an exemplar of what seems to be a self-centered conception of democracy. That is, problems of democracy are seen as unfulfilled individual needs. What is unfair to the junior high student is that he cannot get his books.

On the other hand, in the second protocol a course of action is deemed undemocratic because it harmed another person. While the second student may also view democracy as the fulfilling of needs, she extends this conception to others. As we have seen, this concern for others is a necessary condition for the development of participative citizens. Movement from one stage to the other is a step on the road toward a fully participative citizenry.

Guideline Two

(a) SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ARE MORE CONCERNED WITH GROUP PROBLEMS THAN JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS, AND THE LATER ARE MORE INVOLVED WITH THE CONFLICTS OF INDIVIDUALS.

(b) In the junior high school, problems tend to be seen as conflicts with individuals. Situations are often regarded as isolated occurrences which the individual must resolve for himself. On the other hand, in the senior high school the student has more of a propensity to perceive a linkage between his difficulties and those of other students; a particular problem is not so much "mine" as "ours." More than his younger counterpart, the high school student recognizes that his fate is often linked to that of his peers. Consequently, the senior high student is more likely to see the possibilities of group action as a means of conflict resolution.

(c) The four cross-sectional comparisons show clearly and conclusively that the group factor is more potent in the senior than the junior high school. We coded the protocols according to whether they were written in the singular or plural; there are large differences along this dimension between junior and senior high students in all comparisons. These differences may be due to the greater ability of older adolescents to grasp the fact that one's complaints are shared by others; or it may be due to a greater concern on the part of older students with common problems. In either case, the data show that involvement with group problems increases with age.

(d) Compare these two protocols:

In our school there is a very strict law which prohibits smoking. If someone is caught in this act, they are usually suspended although many teachers will give the accused student another chance if he or she feels it would help the student.

A couple of weeks ago one good friend of mine was caught smoking in school. Her case wasn't a usual case, but one of nervousness. She has very strict parents who let her out once every month and who constantly argue with her. The teacher who caught her was well informed of the student's home life and how much pressure the girl was under because she was her teacher in many subjects. Yet the teacher stormed into the bathroom, told the girl she was sorry and immediately brought her down to the office and suspended her. I've seen this teacher give a lot of other people chances, mostly out of fear of the student. But the girl was a very polite, quiet girl, and the teacher had no sympathy for the girl and was well aware of the treatment the girl would get. As a result the girl is not allowed out at all and soon she's going to start rebelling against her parents. Why does a teacher have the right to give chances to people who couldn't care less, yet convict a girl who needs one?

* * *

This incident took place in this school. Four senior girls (myself included) were troubled about the new policy of taking mid-year exams which the principal had begun. We decided to voice our opinions by way

of a petition which we wrote and made copies of in addition to a flyer advertising its existence. We posted the flyers on various bulletin boards and took the petitions with us to obtain signatures. Next morning, there were no flyers in sight anywhere and we got wind of the fact that the administration was upset about them. The next day we were called to the office and suspended until our parents were called and we were not re-admitted until we admitted we were wrong in what we did. Our argument was that we were simply using what we considered a tool of democracy to make our opinions heard...

While the first protocol is unusual in that concern for the democratic problems of others is relatively rare in junior high school students, it does exemplify junior high protocols in another sense. The focus is on an individual; the writer is concerned that injustice has been done to one person.

In contrast to this concern with individuals, the second protocol illustrates a developmentally higher stage in that the writer deals with a problem common to her fellow students. The focus is not on a problem that applies to only one, or a few people; the issue affects the whole school. This girl attempted to circulate a petition to abolish an examination which, on the basis of the protocols received from the school, was anathema to most of the students.

This identification of one's interests with those of others is an important characteristic of the citizen who is to act for the benefit of his society. Because she perceived common interests, the author of this protocol was in a better position to act than she would have been had she been concerned mainly with her own situation. While it may be possible to rectify individual difficulties with the type of concern demonstrated in the first protocol, large scale participation is not possible. The civic-mindedness of a participative citizen must include concern with problems which affect groups as well as individuals.

Guideline Three

(a) JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS HAVE MORE CONFLICTS WITH THEIR PEERS THAN DO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, WHILE THE LATTER REPORT MORE CONFLICTS WITH AUTHORITY FIGURES THAN DO THE FORMER.

(b) Junior high students see their problems in democracy more with peers than do high school students. While the majority of incidents in both groups deal with authority figures, more junior high students' incidents concern conflicts with other students than do high school students. For the latter the focus of concern with respect to democracy is on the authority and his exercise of power. The concerns of the junior high student are more diffuse: he may fall into conflict with a school official, or he may complain that his friend has treated him unfairly. The latter is often conceived as a pressing problem in democracy for many students. Common examples are youngsters who do not want to smoke, but feel social pressure to do so, and girls whose boy friends are friendly with other girls. Implicit in the use of such examples seems to be the notion that democracy is "fairness"; whatever is fair is democratic, and whatever is not fair is a "problem in democracy." Thought of in this way, democracy is as much a reality in personal as in formal relations. The peer relationship is an integral part of the democratic process for the junior high student, but this is not the case for the high school student.

(c) Again, the cross-sectional comparisons show the difference clearly. There are no exceptions to the trend: incidents involving peers decrease with age, and incidents concerning authorities increase with age. The evidence is convincing that there is a clear developmental difference between junior and senior high students on the "peer-authority" dimension.

(d) The following are typical of the peer group incidents reported in junior high schools:

> I usually hang around with a girl, Miss B. We did everything together. Then one day I met another girl, Miss L. I started hanging around with her. Miss B. got very angry and said I was using her. We don't speak much and she's turning her friends against me but still I will not give up Miss L. as my friend. We have argued in class and teachers have gotten involved and tried to tell Miss B. (she) is unfair to me because you can have more than one friend. She just doesn't get the idea. I've tried to reason. I don't ignore her. I still talk to her, but it doesn't help. I don't think there's any way to solve it except let time do the work.

* * *

> We had just finished an essay and the whole class was grading each story. The grade that the class would give would be final. We were using an overhead projector and each student had to copy his essay over on a transparency.
>
> There was one student, a small, petite girl, a very intelligent girl. But for some reason people or rather most of my friends didn't like her. They were always teasing her. I guess because she was so smart. Anyway she had written a beautiful composition and we both knew that the class would degrade (it) because she wrote it. The essays were supposed to be anonymous. But her handwriting was so bad that everyone knew it was her. So she copied over mine and I copied over hers. It turned out that she got a great grade with my handwriting.

While these protocols illustrate problems students have with each other, the senior high students tend to complain more about problems with authorities:

> The only problem I can bring up is the very structure of this school. We the students have no say at this school. There is little or no chance of actual dissent. The G.O. is only an echo of the school administration. At this moment dissent is limited to verbal talks between students. We have no complete school-wide arena for our gripes. We have an ineffective G.O., an ineffective school newspaper, and no other major channels of debate. We have been promised a student court many times but we still don't have one. What is necessary in order to save democracy in this school is a <u>student</u> revamped G.O., a <u>student</u> revamped school newspaper, and a <u>student</u> revamped court.... We have no recourse for our gripes. Thank you!

The first two protocols illustrate the striking peer group characteristic of the junior high protocols. Social relationships are an integral part of the civic concerns of these students. There seems to be a vague feeling that what is

"unfair" is undemocratic, whether it be a lost boy friend, a fight, or a low grade on an exam.

The senior high protocol shows a student in conflict with institutionalized authority. Older students will rarely speak of a social relationship in democratic terms. The formalized relationships of student versus the school administration or school board is much more common. Any type of "unfairness" no longer falls under the purview of democracy, which is now seen as a way of organizing institutions. As a consequence, students come into more conflict with authorities.

One should not fall into the trap of seeing the progression of civic-mindedness as entirely a widening of interests. While civic concerns are broadened to embrace others and groups, the older students' conception of democracy is narrowed from the inclusion of any type of social relationship to one which embraces only organizations and formal structures. Social relationships are compartmentalized into a different sphere of interest.

Guideline Four

(a) PROBLEMS WITH INSTITUTIONS OCCUR MUCH MORE FREQUENTLY IN THE SENIOR THAN IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, WHILE PROBLEMS WITH PERSONS ARE MORE COMMON IN THE LATTER THAN THE FORMER.

(b) Problems can be caused either by individuals or institutions; that is, people may be responsible qua people, or qua roles which they play in institutions. As we have seen (objective eight above) the perception of this distinction is of peramount importance for effective democratic action. More senior high school students than junior high students seem to make this distinction, as institutional conflicts are reported more often in the senior high schools. High school students are more apt to perceive the institutional aspects and implications of problems than junior high students. Junior high students tend to see conflicts as problems with individual people who may be wrong, stupid, or incompetent, but are not perceived as parts of an institutional process. If a school regulation is the issue, the principal who enforces it is blamed as the individual who has the responsibility for the problem. The senior high student is more likely to see that the principal does not act in isolation from the school as a whole, the Board of Education, district school policy, the superintendent of schools, or local and state laws. This difference may be due partly to the junior high students' relatively lesser concern for problems which may, in fact, have institutional implications. Peer problems generally are more personal than authority-subordinate conflicts, as the latter tend to involve the role of each party within an institutional framework. High school students also tend to personalize, but as they are more concerned with "authority problems," institutional conflicts play a larger role for them than they do for their younger counterparts.

(c) Each protocol was coded according to whether it was expressed as a conflict with a "person" or an "institution." In all four cross-sectional comparisons high school students reported a greater percentage of institutional conflicts than junior high students, and with one exception a much greater share of junior high students related problems with "persons" than did high school students. In the school for gifted girls, there was no difference between the percentage of personal incidents described by junior and senior high students; thus, this school provided the one exception to an otherwise overwhelming trend.

(d) Consider these samples:

Last year in school during eighth period in the class the teacher started picking on me and my friend because she knew us before. The last time we had the teacher she suspended us, giving her a reason to pick on us again.

The hour went slow and this teacher would not help or answer any questions, only to the other kids of the class. She was quite sarcastic so we gave it to her back.

The next day we were called down to the office and were asked to give our side of the story. It really didn't matter though because the teacher wasn't there but had left a note. The principal actually took sides with the teacher and again suspended us.

I think he did this because of the time before and wouldn't give us another chance.

It would have been better for the teacher, principal, and students if they could of sat together, heard each side of the story, and reasoned it out.

* * *

The math teacher was coming down the rows checking homework. This student, by mistake, had done the even number of problems instead of the odd. When the teacher saw that he had done the wrong problems she got very mad and yelled at the student to put his name on the board. The student very politely stated that he was already coming after school. The teacher was very mad at this "student demonstration" so she gave him five nites detention. She sat down and spent 10 minutes telling us how the teachers were going to uprise against the students. The teacher could have just calmly stated that she would rather have the student's name on the board. I feel the teacher was very impractical and hotheaded.

Now compare this type of complaint to the following:

Elementary schools are very good for integrated activities, but high schools (in all states of the union probably) have maintained a rigor mortis in the honors (tracking) system. Disgusting as it is theoretically, in practice it amounts to class (social) and racial segregation of upper middle class whites into "honors"; middle class black and white into "general," and mostly lower class black in "slow." Now, unless you subscribe to the theory that black and poor people are dumb, SOMETHING IS WRONG.

So you agitate for heterogeneous classes. But:

1. They can be agonizingly fast/slow for some students.
2. The upper middle class people, uptight about college, may move away (many going away).
3. It may impair achievement of the honor kids.

I don't know, but the present system is terrible, and the future solution couldn't be much worse.

While the junior high students perceive conflicts with individual persons such as teachers or principals, the high school student discusses a problem of the school system. No individual or group is blamed by this student; the procedure must be changed.

Here we see an extension of concern beyond a person or group of people to an institutional framework itself. It should be emphasized that most high school students do not report institutional conflicts, but there is a much greater frequency in senior high, indicating a tendency to see beyond individual persons.

The relationship between the scope of the problem considered and the institutional-personal aspect is not accidental. The first two protocols deal with isolated incidents which are seen as personal and the third a widespread problem which is institutional. We have seen* that the citizen who cannot see institutional implications is seriously impaired in his capacity for democratic action. We can now add to this the observation that the inability to see institutional aspects of problems restricts the scope of the problem with which one might deal.

Guideline Five

(a) HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS HAVE A MORE HIGHLY DEVELOPED ABSTRACTIVE CAPACITY THAN THEIR JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS.

(b) The four preceding guidelines can be viewed as interdependent in that they all distinguish the junior from the senior high student on the basis of an abstractive faculty, i.e., a capability for extending one's field of action from personal and immediate to more impersonal and remote concerns. In the first guideline we saw that junior high students focus their civic interests on themselves to a greater degree than do high school students. In the second, we saw that junior high students express more conflicts in terms of individuals, while their older counterparts discuss relatively more group problems. In the third, it was pointed out that junior high students experience more peer conflicts than do high school students, and the latter more authority problems than the former. Finally, in the fourth guideline the point was made that junior high students rarely see beyond the person to the institutional nature of a conflict.

The link between the first and second stages in all cases is depersonalization. According to the first guideline, the student develops from a stage of self-centered civic-mindedness to relatively less of the same. According to the second, he moves from a concern with the individual person to a perception of the group factor. The third guideline can also be analyzed along these lines. Perceiving an individual as an authority requires insight into his role; therefore, it requires extension beyond his immediate personal presence. Furthermore, where peers play a significant role in civic-mindedness, one can infer a concern with the immediate social context of existence, as opposed to a conceptual extension to institutional and political issues. Finally, according to the fourth guideline,

---

*See Objective Eight.

the student gradually learns to see beyond the person with whom he is in immediate conflict to the role of the person and the institutional implication of the problem.

In all cases the citizen must go beyond the personal element: in the first situation by extension beyond himself to others; in the second, by extension beyond the individual to the group; in the third, by extension beyond his adversary as a person to institutions, and in the fourth, by extension beyond peers to authority figures. Extension beyond one's self and the immediate situation are the keys to development from the first stage to the second. To reduce this analysis to rock bottom, one could say that the faculty of conceptual extension is the essence of movement from one stage to the other.

(c) The data for this guideline consist of the data for the other four guidelines.

(d) Consider the differences in conceptual extension which are illustrated by the first two protocols, <u>vis a vis</u> the last two:

> There was a conflict within myself in which I had to make a choice. There are three groups which you may be in: the tough, the decent, or in-between.
>
> Most kids thought it wise to be tough or thought it to be the 'in' thing to do. I think the choice is one's own.
>
> I have three friends and one day we were walking to a store. The three of them smoked as they have done for some time. They wanted me to try it so I tried. I wasn't going to lie to them so I told them I didn't like it. But it was my decision. I think they want to be that way because they want to be noticed, respected, and popular. But I think I made the right choice. Why should you be that way if you don't have any reason to be?
>
> • • •
>
> I think the most undemocratic thing that happened to me is the time when I bumped into a kid. We started to fight. He thought I bumped into him on purpose to start a fight. I thought the same thing, that he wanted to start a fight. He called me out in the park. I didn't go because I knew he could beat me up and it was nothing to fight about. He made fun of me and told his friends that I wanted to have a fight with him but I was chicken to. He told everyone. They started to make fun of me. After about a week they stopped it. For about a week every time I passed him he would bump into me.
>
> • • •
>
> Numerous incidents have taken place in this school which indicate a conflict of interpretation of democracy has taken place. One such incident which has not yet been overemphasized is the student's right to privacy of his locker.

A discussion was held between interested students and the school's new superintendent during which the superintendent said he would not hesitate to search a student's locker if he felt that illegal drugs might be found and confiscated from the locker. He would then immediately inform the police, he said.

The question involved is clear: Does the student have the privacy of his own locker? Two opposing opinions arose from the situation.

The superintendent felt that it is the duty of the school to protect the students (whom he felt might be harmed by the drugs) and to uphold the law illegalizing these drugs. If, in the process of doing so, students' lockers would be searched (without warrant) this was justified he felt. It was not clear whether he felt the constitutional right to privacy did not apply to students, lockers, or cases where drugs were involved.

The students felt, of course, that they like all Americans had the right to privacy of property. This would mean that students' belongings including their lockers (which are temporarily theirs) could not be searched without a court-issued warrant.

In the end (if this is the end) as usual the administration made the final decision and (perhaps contrary to the precedent set by ACLU in court which said students, too, are guaranteed the constitutional rights) lockers may be searched at any time by the higher administrators.

* * *

Our school, in an attempt to give underprivileged children another chance has taken in students that have not passed the entrance exam but are recommended by their principal....

What occurred was democratic from one point of view. These students should be given an opportunity to go to a good school where they might be brought up to college level. Their outside problems may have been highly detrimental. Bright children don't always get higher grades....

On the other hand, what of the qualified students who are very intelligent and/or have worked hard to learn a lot. Is it fair to deny them a chance when they are better qualified now? Is it fair to make the underprivileged kids work extra hard just to make a passing grade? Is it fair to put them in a school that gives curriculum 3 years ahead of the norm?

I agree with the second case. I can't see that being democratic is taking away someone else's rights and giving it to another. Good work should and must be rewarded.

The first two protocols illustrate the prevalent junior high stage of civic-mindedness. They both focus on the writer himself and are written on a highly personal, concrete basis; the students go no further than their own immediate problems; the only other parties that concern them are peers. Again,

interpersonal relations play a central role. In the second protocol the student mentions that the most undemocratic "thing" that happened to him was when he "bumped into a kid."

The last two protocols are examples of the most highly developed stage of civic-mindedness found in the study. More typical responses can be found in any of the other guidelines. Unusual protocols were included here to offer examples of responses which are considered to have reached the level of conceptual extension on all guidelines. Of all the students quoted, the authors of these protocols show the greatest evidence of being ready to assume the role of participative citizens in their society.

Conclusion

The objectives and guidelines of this manual have radical implications for four critical areas of the school system.

First, the content of civic courses should no longer consist of abstract problems and principles which have little or no bearing on the student's life. If we are to develop democratic actors, we must aim civic education at the weak spots which vitiate effective action. The problems which concern junior and senior high school students are rarely abstract or political. Students perceive their problems in democracy in the concrete situation which compose their daily lives in both school and community. These concrete situations should be the focus of civic education if students are to find the civic curriculum useful in helping them cope with their civic concerns.

This conception of "course content" does not preclude the teaching of facts and principles. It does, however, change the role such material is to play. Rather than predetermining the facts and principles to be taught, the objectives in this manual require that the facts and conceptual material taught in civics grow naturally from the civic concerns and interests of the students. What facts and concepts are taught to students should be a function of the needs they find in their civic activities.

Second, if the objectives in this manual are to be realized, the traditional teacher-student relationship must be abandoned. If the teacher is a unilateral decision-maker upon whom the students depend for their learning experiences, the learners are not going to develop decision-making ability which, as we have seen, is the most pressing need of contemporary civic education. Furthermore, if students are to develop their own civic concerns as the appropriate content of the civic curriculum, they must be willing and able to make autonomous decisions.

The teacher who wishes to help students become effective civic actors must think of himself as a guide. The civic teacher must be a resource person whose aim is to assist the student in grasping and analyzing the options and relevant considerations involved in his civic problems. The goal, of course, is for the teacher to guide the student in such a way that the learner becomes a mature, autonomous civic decision-maker.

These conceptions of the curriculum content and teacher-student relationship do not leave the traditional conception of the administrator intact. As we have seen from the copious quotes from the protocols, most students' civic concerns

focus on the administration of the school. If students are to learn to participate by acting on their civic interests, they must play a role in the administration of the school. Students who are the subjects of unilateral decision-making processes cannot be expected to flower as participative decision-makers. Only when students are involved in the making of policies and decisions which are of true civic concern to them, will they be learning to make the type of decisions participative citizens must make.

Finally, there are far-reaching implications for the role of youth in their society. All that has been said thus far leads to a definite conception of the part that youth can play in civic affairs. Youngsters until the age of eighteen or perhaps beyond, are commonly thought of as persons outside the purview of the citizenship role. They are conceived as passive recipients of knowledge who will, when they reach a certain age, be ready to assume the responsibilities of citizenship. This conception of youth must be abandoned if students are to be taught to act in civic affairs by pursuing their civic interests.

Only when youths are viewed as citizens, that is, as having the right of participation, will they be allowed to become civic participants; and, it is only as participants that they can learn the decision-making capacities they so sorely lack. To make this clear: persons become citizens when they are given the responsibilities of citizenship; one learns to become a decision-maker by making decisions. When students are given the opportunity to take part in civic action, they will have the experiences necessary to become civic actors.

Clearly, the writing of this manual alone is not sufficient to effect the transformation of the traditional civic education to a new one based on the objectives and guidelines set forth in this document. New conceptions of civic curriculum, the teacher-learner relationship, school administration, and the role of youths as citizens must take effect in the hearts and minds of school and community personnel. The latter must abandon their traditional conception of the school as a monolithic institution run by administrators and teachers who impart preconceived knowledge to voiceless students.

A civic education based on this manual must make a far-reaching commitment to a new conception of high school. The school itself must become a civic community in which all the diverse groups within it take part in effective policies and decisions, and learn to become effective civic actors as they do so. Conceived as such, the school more closely reflects the nature of the community within which it resides, and plays a more effective role in educating citizens who can act to improve the community itself.

SUPPLEMENT

A Guide to the Content of Civic Education

The study pointed up some of the more pressing areas of student interest. It is true, of course, that the interests of students are not the same in all schools and are continually changing within a school, and for this reason no fixed course content can ever be devised for a civic curriculum. Therefore, this appendix is intended to provide clues to the type of student interests the teacher can expect to encounter, rather than a prescription of what to teach.

The content issues were divided into six categories: courses and curriculum, political issues, illegal acts, non-academic school issues, out-of-school social issues, and individual rights. Of these groupings, two accounted for the majority of the incidents reported: non-academic school issues and individual rights. All other incidents were divided about evenly among the other categories, except that "political issues" contained significantly fewer incidents than the other groups.

Predominant non-academic school issues are: the school calendar, attendance regulations, both non-verbal and verbal misbehavior, school government, and racial and ethnic conflict in school. The most significant "individual rights" issues are: teacher favoritism, dress and appearance, the expression of opinions, and parental freedom. All of these issues are concrete and immediate; they directly affect the students' lives.

This is true of all categories except "political issues." "Courses and curriculum" includes incidents dealing with choice of courses, grades, exams, admission requirements, and teaching methods. The category of "illegal acts" embraces incidents involving loitering, smoking, thievery and drugs. "Out of school social issues" involve peer quarrels, social clubs, and racial and ethnic conflict. All these types of incidents are to be found in the daily lives of the students. Only concern with "political issues" requires abstracting to a wider field of interest.

The results of the content analysis, therefore, mesh with the approach of the objectives themselves. If the goal of civic education is to develop civic participants, the content of the curriculum must consist of the issues in which citizens wish to participate. These issues are predominantly the concrete problems students face in their daily lives.

The following list includes all the issues used in the coding and the percentages of each:

I Courses and Curriculum . . . 12.39%

11. Black Studies 1.35%
12. Courses 1.81%
13. Grades. 1.04%
14. Exams 3.49%
15. Teaching Methods. 3.50%
16. Admission Requirements. 1.20%

II Political Issues . . . 6.47%

21. Pledge. 0.53%
22. War and Political Issues. 2.25%
23. Political Speakers. 0.20%
24. In-school Demonstrations. 2.55%
25. Out-of-school Demonstrations. 0.94%

III Illegal Acts. . . 10.33%

31. Drinking. 0.29%
32. Thievery. 1.78%
33. Loitering 2.53%
34. Disruptions 0.45%
35. Drugs 1.50%
36. Smoking 1.75%
37. Harrassment 1.93%

IV Non-Academic School Issues . . . 26.97%

41. Racial, ethnic conflict in school 3.33%
42. School calendar 4.92%
43. Attendance. 2.24%
44. Extra-curricular School Events. 2.68%
45. Verbal Misbehavior. 3.71%
46. Non-verbal Misbehavior. 6.63%
47. Food. 0.19%
48. School Government 2.71%
49. Police. 0.56%

V Out of School Social Issues . . . 10.24%

51. Social Clubs. 0.98%
52. Community Projects. 0.36%
53. Jobs. 0.95%
54. Racial or Ethnic Conflicts. 2.71%
55. Peer Quarrels 5.24%

VI Individual Rights . . . 26.25%

61. Privacy. 0.48%
62. Teacher Favoritism. 10.98%
63. Right to Leave Class. 0.28%
64. Freedom of Movement 0.82%
65. Appearance. 3.40%
66. Parental Freedom. 4.48%
67. Expression of Opinions. 3.53%
68. Use of School Facilities. 0.91%

Not-Classifiable 8.63%

APPENDIX A

Interview Form

Sometimes a group has trouble being as democratic as its members would like it to be. Sometimes a person is not sure what is the democratic thing to do. Other times it seems as if no one can change the way things are enough to make a democracy work in a place like a school or a town. When someone wants to do new things or do things in a new way, it can start a fuss. Please write about one time when something like this happened to you or you saw something like this happen in your group or your school.

Please reread what you wrote now and check to see that you have put in something about each topic below. As you find each item, check it off in the space below. Please add to your story any items you do not already have in it.

Where it happened	( )
Who started it	( )
Who else was there	( )
What problems came up	( )
How were the problems handled	( )
How else could the problems have been handled	( )

Now: we would like to know which our names for problems in democratic behavior fits your story best. Please put number one (1) next to the name that fits best, number two (2) next to the name that fits second best, and so on.

Your story raised problems of:

Dissent	Criticizing, protesting, or refusing to take part in a group	( )
Equality	Getting the same chances in life no matter what your race, religion, sex, or how well off your parents are.	( )
Decision-making	Having a voice in what rules should be made and how they should be enforced.	( )
Due process	Giving a person who has been accused of something a fair chance to defend himself	( )

APPENDIX B

Interviewer Selection and Training

The data gathering team might be regarded as the core of the project. College and graduate students, mostly from fields other than education, were employed to do the interviewing. An article in the New York Times (October 10, 1969) contained a proposal for using college students in schools in a similar role.

> Students Urged as Teacher Aides:
>
> Professor Jerrold Zacharias of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a physicist and education reformer, advocated today a close association between colleges and public-school systems as one of the key solutions to the problem of quality education in the United States.
>
> He urged that college freshmen be enrolled as quickly as possible as teaching assistants in public schools, where their enthusiasm and imagination could play an important role, as well as relieving the pressure on the teaching staffs.
>
> "I would like to see college students start teaching as soon as they enter college, after one or two months of training," Dr. Zacharias said. "We have got to find a way for college students to work for children."
>
> He asserted that the teaching assistant would succeed "if you don't lecture them on educational psychology and other subjects taught in education schools."
>
> The professor also urged the restructuring of curriculums to encourage students to become diverse personalities by exploring their own individual talents instead of having to pursue the traditional system of required subject.

Professor Zacharias' proposal was especially interesting to us since it independently confirmed our original "hunch" that the time was propitious for such an experiment. In the best judgment of the senior staff the experiment worked. The data gathering team worked effectively.

Interviewers were recruited in February 1969 from three sources: (1) Teachers College, Columbia University; (2) City College of the City University of New York, and (3) the New School for Social Research. Placement offices in the first two institutions were notified that the Center wished to hire a staff of interviewers. Notices were posted on the bulletin boards at Teachers College. A staff member who was a graduate student in psychology at the New School for Social Research was asked to spread the word among his friends that interviewers were wanted. All applicants for the job turned out to be either college or graduate students at one of the institutions where they were recruited.

Interviewers were selected from the applicants through a process which was closer to a negotiation than a classical selection procedure. They were told about the nature of the work, length of employment they could expect, scheduling and, at greater length, about the philosophy and ideology of the Center. Each applicant was asked about his plans for the spring and summer months, his major field, and his own ability to communicate with high school youngsters. Those applicants who felt that they could communicate with students and teachers were asked to call back the next day if they wanted the job. All who called back were hired. Thus, the interviewer selected himself into the project. He made the final decision to call or not to call, instead of being told "Don't call us; we'll call

you." The hiring was planned to select for initiative and eagerness to work and confidence in one's ability to communicate with high school students.

In evaluating the recruitment and selection procedure, it is important to keep in mind that we were not attempting to use the interviewers as faceless, interchangeable, neutral stimuli. It was not our intention to be able to evoke the same response with every interviewer, but, rather, to use the interviewers as mediators. They were to be people whom high school students could trust. They were to provide a link between the high school students and the principal investigators, the latter having acquired the stigmata of middle age along with the expertise needed to plan the project.

In our judgment that high school students might respond in a less than candid way to traditional standardized presentations of a request for information, it was important that the interviewers be articulate, capable of presenting the high school students with a stimulating and trust-evoking explanation of what we wanted from them. Furthermore, the interviewers had to be articulate in the current language of high school students rather than in standard English. Had they used standard English and a stereo-type presentation we would have risked getting "goody-goody" standardized replies parrotted straight from the present high-school history texts. Since we had decided to try for meaningful replies rather than standardized ones by asking what seemed to be a meaningful question, it seemed consistent to have a presentation of the question that was meaningful to the person presenting it.

Personnel Retention: Interviewers dropped out of the program at all stages. The first two training sessions convinced eleven out of the original forty-five that the job demanded more than they could or wished to give to it. Of the original forty-five, only twenty-seven remained active in data gathering as late as April 28, by which time most of the data had been gathered. Seven became inactive in the first two weeks of interviewing, one because of illness, two because of family responsibilities and three for reasons unknown. Only one was dropped from the project at the initiative of the project administrator.

Personal Characteristics: The twenty-seven interviewers who did substantial amount of data gathering, i.e., worked more than two days, are described below:

1. Education: Of the twenty-seven, nine were graduate students in psychology at Teachers College, four graduate students enrolled in a philosophy of psychology course at the New School for Social Research, six students in psychology at City College, two students in General Studies at Columbia University (undergraduate), two seniors in education courses at Hunter College, one a Columbia law student, one a former psychology student with several years of experience in related areas and some non-psychology work experience, and one a graduate of Columbia College currently working on a student plan to restructure the University, one a graduate student in political science at Columbia and one a student at Union Theological Seminary.

2. Age: All were between 19 and 30 years old. One was 19 and the remaining 26 ranged in age from 21 to 28.

3. Sex: 17 females and 10 males worked through to the end of April.

4. Ideology: Varying shades of political opinion were expressed by the interviewers. The 27 who remained through the end of April were by their own judgment a politically aware and interested group. Spirited discussion of national political events was characteristic. Since daily newspapers were filled with reports of student protest, discussion of project-related issues in the schools was frequent.

5. Ethnic and physical characteristics: Of the 27 interviewers who remained in the project, three were native born black, three from Caribbean Islands, one Indian, one Iranian, one French student and the remainder were native-born white. Many had long hair, beards and/or other badges of the student protest movement of the time.

Pre-Service Training: Interviewers took part in two training sessions before any data were gathered. The first session was a conventional lecture followed by discussion. The Center's purposes in this particular research project were outlined. Then a systematic description of the Center's history and the role of this project within the Center was presented. The lecture stressed our willingness to re-examine our assumptions, our eagerness to have criticism and objections from the staff and our intention to modify our plans for the project as the discussion changed our views. Participation was invited at every level, from criticism of assumptions and proofreading the basic document to alternative strategies for collection of the data that was to relate the theoretical position embodied in the document to the real world of high school.

The discussion that followed and the discussion of the definitions and theoretical statements in basic document during the next two training sessions evoked such questions as:

"What is democratic behavior?"
"Can an individual behave democratically?"
"Is democracy equivalent to liberty?"
"Why are value judgments used instead of operational definitions in this study?"

The questions evoked substantive reformulations of our philosophy. A major addition to our thought introduced at this time was the concept of choice. We asked now: What choices do people have to make and what difficulties might they have in making these choices? The concept of choice led to the problem: Is it useful just to teach children to think and not to be concerned about how they behave?

The prevalence of a split between the democratic ideals taught and the authoritarian structure of the school was discussed in the context of this question.

Films (discussed in Chapter VIII) of actual classroom situations and some-recreated ones were used in the two following training sessions to stimulate discussion of the relation between our theoretical position and what one could expect of current procedures in the schools to be visited. Due process, dissent, equality and participation were discussed so that interviewers would be able to answer questions about the meaning of these terms should questions arise in the interviews. The interviewers were encouraged to discuss the implications of the filmed incidents in terms of:

1. The conflicting values of different participants in the incident which led to their differing ideas of what the proper outcome should be.

2. The spreading effect of a single incident so that it finally involves more people than may have been overtly involved to begin with.

3. Conflicts in rights between participants in any incident. Thus interviewers were encouraged to see incidents as multi-faceted and open to several interpretations. Their ability to see the school in terms of the school administration, faculty, students and family points of view was stressed.

A video-taped presentation of how to conduct the written interview and a final session to iron out wrinkles encountered during the first school visit completed the interviewer training. One especially interesting topic of discussion during the final session was the reaction of the high school administration to such personal characteristics of interviewers as hair length and skirt length. Experiencing this concrete counterpart of what many high school students were objecting to made the interviewers intensely aware of the kinds of problems in democracy that high school students face.

The discussion began with the question: "Should we change our dress and hair to please the principal so he'll let us in his school?" This led to discussion of such issues as:

"Is it the principal's school?"
"What are his legal responsibilities?"
"Is it legal or ethical to go into the school and risk disruption?"
"Is it fair to set an example that high school students may be punished for following?"
"Can students legally be punished for wearing short skirts or long hair?"

To the extent that this training procedure was successful, the interviewers can be said to have had a valuable learning experience. For the project, it may have enabled them to gather data in schools which would not have accepted their presence if they were not aware of the administration's point of view. For the interviewers themselves, participating probably constituted their first unvarnished glimpse of scientific research.

After the interview data had been gathered, some of the interviewers participated in designing the codes and code books used to reduce the data for statistical treatment. They developed new skills as they designed the new codes. More interviewers were engaged in coding and involved, therefore, in training sessions and the practical decisions which had to be made in the course of the coding process. They developed new competencies in this effort.

The attitudes and competencies of the data-gathering team were changed by their participation in the project and the major investigators changed their positions on some issues as they learned from the experiences they had. For example, Professor DeCecco, before starting the project took the following position:

> The most crucial of these [educational] requirements is the identification of the terminal performance. Explicit, performance statements of instructional objectives identify the end product of instruction in terms of observable human accomplishment, which is the outcome of behavior. To determine whether or not the student has learned something, we observe not his behavior but the outcome of his behavior. (DeCecco, 1968, p. 34.)*

About three-fourths of the way through the project he modified his position:

> The basic purpose of all education is to produce the good man and the good society. I define the good man as civic man and the good society as democratic society.
>
> All education is character education. By educating for character I mean all those broadly conceived curricular experiences in the school which increase the student's sense of dignity and deeply civilize feeling and thought.

---

*DeCecco, John P. The Psychology of Learning and Instruction: Educational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

APPENDIX C

Schools Visited

Baldwin

Brandeis H.S.

Bronx J.H.S.

Cathedral H.S.

Charles Evans Hughes H.S.

Franklin K. Lane H.S.

Freeport H.S.

Grata H.S.

Hastings-on-Hudson J.H. & H.S.

Hunter J.H.S. & H.S.

Immaculate H.S.

Jean of Arc J.H.S.

Immaculate Conception H.S.

New Rochelle H.S.

Nichols J.H.S. & H.S.

No. Salem Middle School

Notre Dame H.S.

School of the Ascension H.S.

Sleepy Hollow H.S.

St. Hilda's H.S.

William Grady Vocational H.S.

Woodlands H.S.

I.S. 88

P.S. 146

P.S. 165

P.S. 179

P.S. 207

P.S. 208

Community Center

Community Resource Center

Street Academies

APPENDIX D

Characteristics of Sample Schools Visited

School	Type of Community	No. of Students	School Level	School Classification	Type of Parental Occupation
P.S. 163	Urban	1,700	Elementary	Public	Blue collar
Lincoln J.H.S.	Suburban	700	J.H.S.	Public	Blue and White collar/prof.
Joan of Arc	Urban	1,355	J.H.S.	Public	Blue collar
Hastings	Suburban	950	J.H.S./H.S.	Public	Blue and white collar/prof.
Irvington	Urban	5,000	H.S.	Public	Blue collar
Chas. E. Hughes	Urban	2,800	H.S.	Public	Blue collar
Grata	Urban	4,203	H.S.	Public	Blue collar
Hunter	Urban	1,130	H.S.	Special	White collar/prof.
Immaculata	Urban	258	H.S.	Parochial	Blue and white collar
Lincoln H.S.	Suburban	1,800	H.S.	Public	Blue and white collar/prof.
New Rochelle	Suburban	2,800	H.S.	Public	White collar/prof.
Rice	Urban	950	H.S.	Parochial	Blue collar
Sleepy Hollow	Suburban	1,065	H.S.	Public	Blue collar and white collar/prof.
Woodlands	Suburban	1,300	H.S.	Public	Blue and white collar/prof.

School	Are there extra curricular activities	Is there a Student Government	Total Faculty	Faculty with 3-4 years experience	Faculty with 4-10 years experience	Faculty with over 10 years experience
P.S. 163	No	No	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
Minsola J.H.S.	Yes	Yes	45	15	15	15
Joan of Arc	Yes	Yes	96	66	27	7
Hastings	Yes	Yes	113	9	60	44
Bronxdale	Yes	Yes	243	195	37	11
Chas. E. Hughes	Yes	Yes	170	50	75	45
Lewis	Yes	Yes	195	140	50	5
Hunter	Yes	Yes	83	28	37	18
Immaculate	Yes	Yes	13	2	11	0
Minsola H.S.	Yes	Yes	125	62	32	31
New Rochelle	Yes	Yes	160	60	60	40
Rice	Yes	Yes	30	n.d.	n.d.	2
Sleepy Hollow	Yes	Yes	75	20	35	20
Woodlands	Yes	Yes	104	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.

n.d. - no data.

School	Are students grouped homogeneously according to academic ability	No. of drop-outs 68-69 for any reason	No. of students entering after school starts	No. of dues paying PTA members	Average attendance at PTA meetings	Average expenditure per pupil
P.S. 165	Yes/no	470	550	348	40	750
Mineola J.H.S.	Yes	n.d.	n.d.	250	150	1,489
Joan of Arc	Yes/no	327	250	100	60	1,123
Hastings	Yes/no	73	64	662	250	1,200
Brandeis	Yes	1,800	1,200	80	30	1,045
Chas. E. Hughes	Yes	450	450	n.d.	45	1,036
Crete	Yes/no	761	298	1,500	150	n.d.
Hunter	Yes	3	0	565	226	800
Immaculate	Yes	2	4	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
Mineola H.S.	Yes/no	10	10	n.d.	n.d.	1,489
New Rochelle	Yes	168	150	500	150	1,200
Rice	Yes	16	16	n.d.	570	n.d.
Sleepy Hollow	Yes	20	25	800	60	1,200
Woodlands	Yes/no	4	5	700	100	1,000

n.d. - no data.

School	% of Students who are Black	% of Students who are Puerto Rican	% of Students who are "Other"	% Participation in extra curricular activities	% of Students employed after school
P.S. 165	10.	70.	20.	n.d.	-
Miscole J.H.S.	07.	01.	92.	50.	-
Joan of Arc	33.	48.	19.	50.	-
Hastings	03.	00.	97.	40.	5 - 25%
Brandeis	50.	35.	15.	20.	over 50%
Chas. E. Hughes	66.	15.	19.	25.	25 - 50%
Seats	100.	00.	00.	03.	25 - 50%
Hunter	25.	00.	75.	75.	5 - 25%
Immaculate	05.	10.	85.	50.	5 - 25%
Miscole H.S.	04.	00.	96.	35.	over 50%
New Rochelle	15.	00.	85.	15.	n.d.
Rice	10.	05.	85.	50.	over 50%
Sleepy Hollow	07.	08.	85.	60.	under 5%
Westlands	35.	00.	65.	75.	over 50%

n.d. - no data - - not applicable.

School	Percentage of Students enrolled in College Prep. Program	General Program	Commercial Program	Tech. Trade Program	% of class '68 continuing to College/Technical School
P.S. 163	-	-	-	-	-
Bianchi J.H.S.	86.	14.	-	-	-
Joan of Arc	-	-	-	-	-
Hastings	88.	12.	-	-	85.
Brandeis	55.	40.	05.	-	15.
Chas. E. Hughes	50.	50.	-	-	19.
Cretz	19.	24.	57.	-	04.
Hunter	100.	-	-	-	75.
Immaculate	97.	03.	-	-	85.
Mineola J.H.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	55.
New Rochelle	60.	-	20.	18.	54.
Rice	42.	48.	-	-	30.
Sleepy Hollow	75.	19.	06.	-	60.
Woodlands	65.	15.	15.	05.	71.

n.d. = no data - = not applicable

APPENDIX E

Code Book

COLUMNS		
1-2	Card Identification - 91 -	
4-7	Consecutive number from protocol - 0001 - 9999 (right justified)	
9-10	School Code - 01 - 99 (right justified)	
12-13	Grade Code - Code 00 for none, otherwise code grade level Code year (right justified) 04-12 mixed 9 & 10 = 20 10 & 11 = 21 11 & 12 = 23 9, 10, 11 = 24	
15	Group I.D. number	0 - none 1 - honors 2 - C.P. Academic 3 - general 4 - vocational 5 - rater's observation 6 - non-school group 7 - teacher 8 - administrator 9 - special problems classes
17-18	First rater gathering data - 01 - 99	
20-21	Second rater gathering data (if present; if not code 00) Code as on 17-18	
23	Respondents rating on dissent 0-4	
24	Respondents rating on equality 0-4	
25	Respondents rating on decision 0-4	
26	Respondents rating on due process 0-4	
28-29	First rater coding participation categories (rater number) 01 - 99	
31	First rater's coding on dissent 0-4	
32	First rater's coding on equality 0-4	
33	First rater's coding on decision 0-4	
34	First rater's coding on due process 0-4	
36-37	First rater's coding content and process	
39	Was the protocol an incident?	Yes = 1 No = 2
41-42	Content Categories I - 11-67 See Code in Appendix D	
44-45	Content Categories II (same as 41-42) - 11-67	
47	Interpersonal involvement Code	1 - Personal Self "I" (Go on to Track 1) 2 - Participation Group "We" (Go on to Track 2) 3 - Observed Individual "He" (Go on to Track 3) 4 - Another Observed Group "They" (Go on to Track 4)

Personal - Track 1

Column

49 Was the major conflict in the situation expressed as between
CODE 1 the writer and another person (even a teacher or principal); or the writer and persons who do not constitute a group?
2 the writer and a group of which he is a member?
3 the writer and a group of which he is not a member?
4 the writer and an institution?

51 Between whom did the writer say he saw the major conflict?
0 does not apply?
1 himself and (a) peer(s)?
2 himself and (an) authority(ies)?
3 himself and (a) subordinate(s)?

53 How many alternative courses of action to the one taken did the writer say he saw for himself?
1 none?
2 one or more?

55 Was the choice between
0 only one course of action - no choice?
1 his conviction and an expedient act?
2 two or more of his convictions?
3 two or more expedient acts?

NOW GO TO CONFLICT RESOLUTION Column 57

The Writer's Group - Track 2

49 Was the major conflict in the situation expressed as between
1 the writer's group and another person (even a teacher or principal)?
2 different parts of the writer's group?
3 the writer's group and another group?
4 the writer's group and an institution?

51 Between whom did the writer say he saw the major conflict?
0 does not apply?
1 his group and (a) peer(s); his group and another group?
2 his group and (an) authority(ies)?
3 his group and (a) subordinate(s)?

53 How many alternative courses of action to the one taken did the writer say he saw for himself and/or his group in the situation?
1 none?
2 one or more?

55 Was the choice between
- 0 only one course of action - no choice?
- 1 the writer's or his group's conviction and an expedient act?
- 2 two or more of the writer's or his group's convictions?
- 3 two or more expedient acts?

NOW GO ON TO CONFLICT RESOLUTION Column 57

Another Person - Track 3

49 Was the major conflict in the situation expressed as between
- 1 two or more other individuals (even if teacher or principal)?
- 2 the other person and his own group?
- 3 the other person and a group in which he is not a member?
- 4 the other person and an institution?

51 Between whom did the writer say he saw the major conflict?
- 0 does not apply?
- 1 the other person and (a) peer(s)?
- 2 the other person and (an) authority(ies)?
- 3 the other person and (a) subordinate(s)?

53 How many alternative courses of action to the course taken did the writer say he saw for the other person in the situation?
- 1 no alternative?
- 2 one or more alternatives?

55 Was the choice between
- 0 only one course of action - no choice?
- 1 the other person's conviction and an expedient act?
- 2 two or more of the other person's convictions?
- 3 two or more expedient acts?

NOW GO ON TO CONFLICT RESOLUTION Column 57

A Group of which the writer is not a member - Track 4

49 Was the major conflict in the situation expressed as between
- 1 that group and an individual or individuals (even a tecner or principal)?
- 2 different parts of that same group?
- 3 that group and some other group(s)?
- 4 that group and an institution?

51 Between whom did the writer say he saw the major conflict?
- 0 does not apply?
- 1 the group and (a) peer(s); the group and another group
- 2 the group and (an) authority(ies)?
- 3 the group and (a) subordinate(s)?

53 How many alternative courses of action to the one taken did the witer see for that group in the situation?
- 1 no alternative?
- 2 one or more alternatives?

55 Was the choice between
- 0 only one course of action - no choice?
- 1 that group's conviction and an expedient act?
- 2 two or more of the group's convictions?
- 3 two or more expedient acts?

NOW GO ON TO CONFLICT RESOLUTION Column 57

Resolution of the Conflict

57 Did the writer see the conflict as resolved and/or terminated? (Call an incident terminated if it is over, even if not especially satisfactorily. The "parties" referred to below are identical to the person(s) or group(s) described in the setting. "Participation" means the party or parties affected the decision taken.)
- 1 resolved with the participation of all of the parties to the conflict?
- 2 resolved with the participation of some of the parties to the conflict?
- 3 resolved with the participation of only one of the parties to the conflict?
- 4 unresolved?

For columns 58-67 code all the columns either yes or no; more than one choice is possible.

	Was the resolution attempted by:	code no	code yes
59	negotiation - talks among the people involved?	0	1
60	violence or force from peer(s)?	0	1
61	violence or force from subordinates?	0	1
62	violence or force from authority?	0	1
63	decision by authority?	0	1
64	formal vote - elections?	0	1
65	mediation - talks among the people involved and an outsider?	0	1
66	agreed to arbitration - leeting an outsider judge the dispute between the people involved?	0	1
67	verbal threats of force	0	1
68	petitions	0	1

69 According to the writer, was the outcome?
- 1 bad?
- 2 good?
- 3 mixed?
- 4 unclear?

71 According to the writer, was his immediate level of tension as a result of the outcome?
- 1 raised?
- 2 lowered?
- 3 unchanged?
- 4 unstated or unclear?

APPENDIX F

Content Categories

1. Courses and Curriculum
   - 11. black studies, etc. - history
   - 12. courses - adding new ones to the curriculum other than black studies; program changes; permission to take courses
   - 13. pass-fail, other grade issues - honor societies
   - 14. exams - midterms, finals
   - 15. teaching methods (techniques) - homework, memorization, etc.
   - 16. admission requirements to the school, school standards

2. Political Issues
   - 21. pledge of allegiance
   - 22. war
   - 23. political speakers
   - 24. in-school demonstrations
   - 25. out-of-school demonstrations dealing with larger than school issues

3. Illegal Acts - Real or Alleged
   - 31. drinking
   - 32. thievery
   - 33. loitering, minor (property) violations
   - 34. disruptions - major property damage, large fires, etc.
   - 35. drugs, including pot
   - 36. smoking on school grounds - tobacco
   - 37. harrassment without accusation; police contact short of charges

4. Non-Academic School Issues
   - 40. racial conflict in school
   - 41. school calendar - snow days, etc.
   - 42. attendance at school - daily regulations (including lateness)
   - 43. extra-curricular school events - bake sale, auctions, school or class paper as an institution
   - 44. verbal misbehavior, real or alleged; includes passing notes, talking, etc.
   - 45. non-verbal misbehavior; real or alleged violence, property damage, fighting, running in the halls, etc.
   - 46. quality of food
   - 47. school government
   - 48. police on school grounds

5. Out of School Social Issues
   - 51. social club, entrance into or expulsion from
   - 52. community project, like a recreation center
   - 53. job, applying for or dismissal from
   - 54. racial or ethnic conflict out of school
   - 55. peer quarrels out of school